On his death-bed, the Buddha advised his disciples to rely on the monastic discipline he had expounded. Consequently, the title dāsī 大師, Great Master, originally reserved for the Buddha himself, was transferred to the title of precepts (pratikrama) for monks (bhikṣu) and nuns (bhikṣuṇī). The pratikrama became their dāsī. Monastic discipline is thus clearly one of the essential strongholds of Buddhism, the protectors of which are in the first place the monks and nuns. This central position of monastic discipline does not imply that all monasteries applied exactly the same rules. From the beginning of the spread of monastic Buddhism, different rules or different interpretations of the rules started to emerge, and various schools (ṣāṅghikas) arose. These schools were defined on the basis of their disciplinary texts (ṣaṅgīnas).

When Buddhism entered China in the first century A.D., it was the monks of the northern Buddhist schools who formed the first Buddhist

---

FURTHER SOURCES


[2] See, for instance, a recent study on the rules and functions of the samgha according to the early Buddhist texts: Frerkenberger 2000 [particularly pp. 39-42].

[3] The term was also used for buddhañc and eminent monks (Buddhaindpung 1994, p. 391).

[4] See, for instance, a recent study on the rules and functions of the samgha according to the early Buddhist texts: Frerkenberger 2000 [particularly pp. 39-42].

---

[5] The term was also used for buddhañc and eminent monks (Buddhaindpung 1994, p. 391).

[6] See, for instance, a recent study on the rules and functions of the samgha according to the early Buddhist texts: Frerkenberger 2000 [particularly pp. 39-42].
communities referring to their respective viṣṇya traditions. Later, when the sea route between India and China became more popular, the monks of the southern part of the Indian subcontinent also started to exert some influence. The first viṣṇya texts were most probably introduced orally and in a foreign language, for the use of the foreign monks. When, in the third and the fourth centuries, later generations of immigrants lost contact with their original languages and more and more Chinese entered the monasteries, the need for translations of disciplinary texts became urgent. By the end of the fifth century, the most important viṣṇya translations were finished, and were available in Buddhist monasteries all over the country. More than two centuries later, one more viṣṇya was introduced to China, the Dharmaniratanaśāstra, translated at the beginning of the eighth century. Curiously enough this was exactly the same time as another viṣṇya, the Dhammachakkaśāstra, was imposed on the whole of China. From that time on until today, the latter viṣṇya has been followed in all Chinese monasteries.

The following paper aims to trace the history of the Chinese viṣṇya texts from their introduction to the firm establishment of the Dharmaniratanaśāstra. It covers a period that goes from the fall of the Han 漢 dynasty to the days following Emperor Wu Zetian's 魏武天 reign (680-705). When in 220 AD the Han dynasty came to an end, the country broke up into three kingdoms, the Wei 魏, the Shuhan 蜀漢, and the Wu 吳. They were temporarily brought together again by the Western Jin 西晉 dynasty (280-316). This was a rather weak dynasty, unable to defend itself against the many attacks of foreign northern troops. Consequently, the Chinese had to withdraw to the south of China. This was the start of the so-called north-south division of China that would last until 589. In the north, many foreign kingdoms arose, the most important of which was the Northern Wei 北魏 dynasty (386-535) that occupied a large part of Northern China. The Northern Wei controlled major cities such as Chang'an 長安 (modern Xi'an 西安) and Luoyang 洛陽. In the south, several Chinese dynasties succeeded one another: the Eastern Jin 東晉 (316-420), the Liu Song 劉宋 (420-479), the Qi 齊 (479-502), the Liang 梁 (502-557), and the Chen 関 (557-581). The capital was Fanyang (modern Nanjing). The country was re-united by the Sui dynasty in 589. The dynasty did not last long, however, and in 618 a general called Li Yuan started the Tang 唐 dynasty. This dynasty lasted until 906, but was temporarily interrupted by the Zhou 周 dynasty (690-705), founded by Wu Zetian, a former concubine of two Tang emperors. It is in between the fall of the Han and the re-establishment of the Tang, that the history of the Chinese viṣṇya texts was decided.

2. The Earliest Viṣṇya Texts

Around the first century AD, Buddhist monks and lay followers started to enter China along the merchant land routes from India to China, and small Buddhist communities arose. The first monks all were foreigners. They most probably transmitted the disciplinary text orally. This was still the case in the Central Asian countries when the monk Faxian 法顯 travelled through the region in the beginning of the fifth century.

2.1. Disciplinary Rules for Monks

According to the Official History of the Sui 唐 dynasty, the first Chinese monk was ordained in the Huayang period (220-226) of the Wei kingdom. Many bugscholars, however, consider Yan Fuqiao 言福緒, a collaborator of An Shigao 安世高 at the end of the second century, to be the first known Chinese monk. Once the Buddhist community began to attract more and more Chinese speaking followers, it seemed logical that the need for Chinese translations of the disciplinary texts grew. An additional reason for these translations might have been that later generations of foreign Buddhist families lost contact with their original languages and more and more needed to rely...
on Chinese texts. According to the Gaungs Zhou 舊諸周 (Biographies of Eminent Monks), compiled by Huijiao 惠曉 ca. 530 AD, the first
single text translated into Chinese is a text called Senggoubei 僧伽婆毘 (The Heart of Precepts of the Mahāyāna) texts. The Gaungs Zhou tells
us that the translation was done by Dharmakīśa, a native of Central
India, who arrived in Luoyang around 250 AD. Still, since no text by
this title is mentioned in the earliest extant catalogue, the Chi sanzang jii 白三藏記集 (Collection of Records concerning the Tripitaka) compiled by Sengoubei 僧伽婆毘 between 510 and 518, it is not certain
that Dharmakīśa indeed translated such a text. Only in relatively late
catalogues, do we find references to it. The title of the translation,
Senggoubei, probably refers to a prātimokṣa of the Mahāyāna school.12
The text is not extant. Huijiao also claims that Dharmakīśa, who was
able to recite all the sūtras, introduced the first ordination tradition to
China with the help of Indian monks.13 In all probability, the Indian
monks were needed in order to obtain a sufficient number of ordained
participants necessary to hold a legally valid ordination ceremony.14
For various reasons, it is not possible to determine which ordination
ceremony or which school Dharmakīśa might have introduced. First
of all, we do not know to which school Dharmakīśa himself belonged.
Instead, he is said to have been acquainted with all the stages. In
addition, the school affiliation of the Indian monks is not mentioned,
and, finally, we have no reference to the basic legal text used at the
ordination ritual.

13 Also in the chapter on Buddhism and Daoism of the Wei, a history of the
Northern Wei dynasty, compiled by Wei Shou 蘇 in 551-553, Dharmakīśa is said to have
translated a prātimokṣa (Wei, vol. 8, p. 3025).
14 Date's compilation of the catalogues: Mizuno 1998, pp. 107-206.
15 Huijiao, T2009.30.31291-9; Wei Shou in 551-553, Dharmakīśa is said to have
translated a prātimokṣa (Wei, vol. 8, p. 3025).
16 Date's compilation of the catalogues: Mizuno 1998, pp. 107-206.
18 Huijiao, T2009.30.31291-9; Wei Shou in 551-553, Dharmakīśa is said to have
translated a prātimokṣa (Wei, vol. 8, p. 3025).

The first texts on legal procedures (karmāṇaśāstra texts) translated into
Chinese are, according to some catalogues, two Dharmaguptaka texts:
the Yantou sūtra (Sūtra of the Dharmaguptaka School), translated in 252 AD by the Sogdian
Kang Sengkai 蓮恩信 (Samghavarman)15 and the Jīa sūtra (T1433, Karmāṇaśāstra),
translated in 254 AD by the Parthian Taadło 領尊 (Dharmasasayā).16 Also Huijiao, in his Gaungs Zhou,17 refers to an
early Dharmaguptaka karmāṇaśāstra text, translated by Tani. Of Kang Sengkai, Huijiao says that he has translated four texts. Since he only
gives the name of one, non-śīla, work, it is not certain that he thought a
karmāṇaśāstra to be among the texts translated by Kang Sengkai. It is
further remarkable that the earliest extant catalogue, the Chi sanzang jii, does not mention either of these early karmāṇaśāstra translations.
They are only recorded in later catalogues. Moreover, A. Hiraizawa18 provides extensive evidence that the two texts should be considered as
a later redaction based on the Chinese Dharmaguptakavāja, T1428.

The similarity of the Chinese terminology indeed indicates that these
karmāṇaśāstra texts were probably compiled after the translation of the
Dharmaguptakavāja in the early fifth century. Still, some differences in
the chapters on the śīla19 and the ordination reveal that the karmāṇaśāstra
texts are not collections of procedures merely borrowed from T1428,
but further developments of the same Dharmaguptaka tradition.20

The above does not necessarily imply that there were never such
early śīla translations. Many early Buddhist masters were convinced of
their existence, and claimed that the first legal ordinances in China

15 T1433: Zhiheng, T2154.53.48625-24-48747, 619b6-7, 658b23-24, 730b21-22 (AD
730), Yanyanzhao, T2157.55.73417-24, 926b15-16, 105a10-11, 140a15 (AD 800),
1433: Fajing et al., T2166.53.146013 (AD 794), Yanyanzhao, T2147.55.156012
(AD 562), Fajing et al., T2166.53.145517-18 (AD 654), Zhiheng, T2145.55.28710-11,
303b15-16, 535b10-19 (AD 660), Jingmai, T2151.55.31565-7 (AD 627-49), Murugan
et al., T2153.55.41720-22 (AD 695), Zhiheng, T2154-55.48728-29, 619b6-7, 730b21-22
(AD 730), Jingmai, T2157.55.73417-24, 926b15-16, 105a10-11, 140a15 (AD 800).
18 Huijiao, T2009.50.32545-4.
21 In order to have a legally valid procedure, any formal act has to be carried out
within a well defined district (pāla) by a harmonious order (śānta parivarta), i.e., an
appropriate and unanimous order, see Strickland-P Zeitlin 1922, pp. 27-29. See also the
notes 175-177.
were based on the legal procedures of the Dharmaguptaka school as described in the *karmasiddha* texts. As we will see further, this is probably one of the reasons why the Dharmaguptaka ordination eventually was accepted as the only true one in China. But even if Chinese *vinaya* texts were available around the middle of the third century, they cannot have been widespread since about one hundred years later, monks such as Da'an 信安 (312–383) pointed to the many difficulties in governing the Buddhist monasteries due to the lack of such texts. In order to temporally rectify this situation, Da'an even made some rules of his own. Besides this, he tried to encourage the translation of *vinaya* texts. Da'an himself is sometimes said to have translated a *Bhagavadgītā* (Vinoda) based on the *Sarvastivādin vinaya*. He further suggested inviting the famous translator Kumārānta (345–413) to China. The latter finally arrived in Chang'an sixteen years after Da'an's death.

2.2. Disciplinary Rules for Nuns

Also for women, the lack of *vinaya* texts in the first period of Buddhism in China constituted a serious problem. Just like their male counterparts, women could not rely on any rules to start a monastic community. In addition, since, as far as we know, nuns never crossed the mountains from India to China, no foreign community of nuns existed in China in the first centuries AD. According to the *Chu sanyāga yi xì*, the first *vinaya* text for nuns translated into Chinese was the *Bijanī jīnī* translated by Dharmarāja in the second half of the third century AD. Sengyou adds, however, that the text is lost. Still, since Sengyou mentions this work, A. Hirakawa is of the opinion that it must have existed.

According to the *Bijanī jīnī* (Biṣṣumnīs), the first Chinese nun was Zhu Jingian 茹靖然 (ca. 299–361). When in the beginning of the fourth century, she wanted to become a nun, she was told that in China the rules for nun were not complete, but that in foreign countries these rules existed. Yet, according to the *Bijanī jīnī*, in the middle of the fourth century Zhu Jingian and four other women were ordained before the bhikṣunī ("community of monks") on the basis of a *karmasiddha* and of a *prātimoksa* of the Mahāsanghika school. There is, however, no evidence of these Mahāsanghika works, as pointed out by Z. Takamatu. Also after Zhu Jingian's ordination the search for *vinaya* rules clearly continued. This search is described in three short comments in the *Chu sanyāga yi xì*. These narrate in detail the translation into Chinese of a *bhikṣunīprātimoksa* at the end of 379 AD or in the beginning of 380 AD. The text had been obtained in Kucha (Kuē) by the monk Sengchūn 僧咒, and has been translated by Tamnōchi 泰揭持 (Dharmajī) and Zhu Jionian 茹道念. According to A. Hirakawa, it is beyond doubt that this no longer extant work once existed. The above comments also mention

---

28 According to Z. Zürcher (1990, pp. 169–182), it is still the way how early Buddhist spread in China that caused this defective transmission of *vinaya* texts. The spread of Buddhism was not a case of "massive expansion", but the result of "a long-distance transmission". The northwest of China was initially only a transit zone, with no firm establishments. Therefore, monks in more eastern and southern centers easily lost their feed-back, and transmission of texts often failed, certainly after the Chinese in the beginning of the fourth century lost control of the northern part of China.
30 See Daoxuan, T.2145.55.30063–4 and 32141–18. Dao'an translated a *Bhagavadgītā* together with Zhu Jionian. In all probability, this refers to a text translated in 583 by Zhu Jionian, with a preface of Dao'an (= T.1464) and Yuyama (1797, pp. 7–9). On some other *vinaya* translations (no longer extant) made at the end of the fourth century, see Wang 1994, p. 167.
31 Harrington was born in Kucha (Kuē), in Central Asia. At an early age, he entered the monastic order. In 491, he arrived in Chang'an where he distinguished himself as an outstanding translator of both *Sarvastivāda* and Mahāyāna texts.
that, an apocryphal tradition of five hundred precepts for bhikṣuṇīs compiled by the monk Mili 梁敷, had existed, but was lost.

Finally, a complete set of rules for nuns became available when in the beginning of the fifth century, four śiṅgas were translated into Chinese.

2.3. Fāxián Goes to India

As seen above, in the fourth century there was not yet a Chinese translation of an entire śiṅga text. This deficiency prompted the monk Fāxián 阇㤅 (524–597) to undertake a trip from Chang'an to India in 599. His travel account tells us that his main purpose was to obtain an original version of the śiṅga.44 This was not an easy task, since, according to Fāxián, in the countries of “Northern India”, śiṅga texts were transmitted only orally.45 Consequently, Fāxián had to go further south to what he calls “Central India”,46 where, in Bādarpūra (modern Patna), he succeeded in copying the śiṅga of the Mahāsāntikā school. He was also able to obtain extracts47 of the Sārāṣṭrīśāṅkhaśinga. Fāxián remarks that the latter śiṅga was the śiṅga used by the Chinese at that time, but that it was, in China, transmitted only orally.48 On his journey further to the south, he received a copy of the Mahākāśikāśinga in Sri Lanka.49 After a long and perilous journey at sea, he finally sailed back to China in 414. Although his ship totally lost its direction, it eventually managed to reach the present-day province of Shandong. From there, Fāxián travelled south to Jianlāng, where the Buddhist master Buddhābhābāla translated several of the texts that he had obtained, including the Mahāsāntikāśinga.50

3. The Translation of Śiṅga Texts. The Northern Schools

3.1. The Fifth Century

The first śiṅga texts entered China via the northern land routes. These texts all belong to the so-called northern tradition, in opposition to the southern, that is, the Pāli Theravāda tradition. At the end of the fourth century in any case, a complete śiṅga had yet been translated. This situation changed rapidly when in the beginning of the fifth century51 four complete śiṅga texts were translated into Chinese.52 The first one was the Śrīnakaṭṭha śiṅga (T1435, Śrīnakāṭṭha śiṅga in Ten Recitations), Sarāṣṭrīśāṅkhaśinga, translated between 404 and 406 by Vūparatana/Vypparatana,53 Kumārajīva and Dharmakūta, and revised a few years later by Vimalakirti.54 The translation team worked in Chang’an, at that time the capital of the Yōn Qián 倚象 or Later Qián 后梁 (304–474),55 one of the northern

---

44. 聖教賢賢闍頂, T2005.51.8575a3-9, 956b17, 964c1-3.
45. 布提提诃始訶為北天竺語 (Fāxián, T2005.51.856b17).
46. 布提提訶始訶為北天竺語 (Fāxián, T2005.51.856b17).
47. 聖教賢賢闍頂, T2005.51.864b17-18.
49. 在一 Mahāsāntikā school called the Devadāsa monastery (Roth 1970, pp. 19-20).
50. Extracts (see n. 8) of Mahāsāntikā (955, p. 711), consisting of ca. seven thousand stanzas (Fāxián, T2005.51.856b23-24). According to Senguo, T2145.23.12a7 and 13-14, these extracts have not been translated.
54. Since then, and apart from the four complete śiṅga, many other śiṅga texts, such as lists of precepts (prātimokṣa) and lists of procedures (karma-maṇḍala), have been translated. Among the latter texts also figure some texts of two other schools of which complete versions do not survive in Chinese. These are the Kāśyapā school of which a Mahākāśikāśinga has been translated by Upākara in S254 (Śrīkṣaṭṭha, T1460), and the Samantabhadra school, known through the translation of a commentary on a lost Mahākāśikāśinga by Paramartha in S268 (Śrīkṣaṭṭha, T1460). For details, see Yuyawa 1979.
55. The fifth century also saw a growing popularity of the so-called bhikṣāna rules, intended to provide the Chinese Buddhist community with a guide of Mahāyāna moral precepts. The most influential text is the Paṇḍita jīvinga (T1484), the Bhārata’s Jīvinga, that contains a set of fifty-eight precepts. This text has been translated into French by J. F. M. De Groote, Le code du Mahāyāna en Chine, Son influence sur le vinaya tanka et sur le manuel latijn, Amsterdam, Johannes Müller 1893. Although the Paṇḍita jīvinga is traditionally said to have been translated from Sanskrit into Chinese by Kumārajīva in 406, it is in fact a text composed in China probably around the middle of the fifth century. The Paṇḍita jīvinga was considered to be a Mahāyāna supplement, and in China until today, the ordination based on the traditional Śrīnakaṭṭha śiṅga texts always comes first. This is in accordance with the opinion expressed in texts such as the Bhāratajīvinga, Šīlin of the Buddhaśintas, of which two translations (one based on two different Indian versions, of c. 1930, p. 225) were made in the fifth century. One is the Paṇḍita jīvinga, 善現地稅法 (T1584), translated by Tukvuchen 項瞿舍家 (between 414 and 417; see, in particular, T1584.50.101b10ff). The other one is the Paṇḍita jīvinga, Tukvuchen 項瞿舍家 (T1582) and Tukvuchen 項瞿舍家 (the latter text might be the tenth scroll of Tukvuchen 項瞿舍家, T1582, c. 954, p. 390), translated by Upākara in 414 (see, in particular, T582.30.1013b24-1014a25). For more details see, among others, Demidoff 1920; Groener 1990a, pp. 251-257; Groener 1990b; Ruo 1994, pp. 37-50.
56. 東明寺. 34. See Yuyawa 1979, p. 8.
57. 阿房宫. 34. See Groener 1990, p. 15.
dynasties. According to the Gaoshang Zhenru,\(^{28}\) the Kashmirian monk Pumaprata recited the Indian text, while Kumārajīva translated it into Chinese. Kumārajīva was born in Kucha, the son of an Indian father. His mother was related to the Kucha royal family. When the text was not yet finished, Pumaprata died. His task was continued by another western monk, Dhammaruci, who is said to have brought a copy of the text.\(^{28}\) In 405, the Kashmirian monk Vimalakīrti came to Chang’an to meet Kumārajīva. Vimalakīrti had been Kumārajīva’s teacher in Kucha. From him, Kumārajīva had learned the Sūtrasāraśīlaśāstra. After the death of Kumārajīva, Vimalakīrti left Chang’an and went to the present-day province of Anhui 安徽. There, he revised Kumārajīva’s translation. Vimalakīrti continued to propagate the Sūtrasāraśīlaśāstra and his teaching even reached the southern capital Jiankang 建康.

A second sūtra translated into Chinese was the Syāmāśīla 分四法 (T.1428, Viṣṇu in Four Parts), Dharmaguptakāśitaśāstra,\(^{27}\) translated by Buddhāyaśas and Zhu Fuxian 穗佛念 between 410 and 412. Buddhāyaśas was born in Kashmir (Kashmir). After his ordination, he went to Kashgar, where he met his former disciple Kumārajīva. He later moved to Kucha, and then finally travelled to Chang’an where he again encountered Kumārajīva. It was in Chang’an that a translation team led by Buddhāyaśas began to translate the Dharmaguptakāśitaśāstra, Buddhāyaśas recited the text by memory, Zhu Fuxian,\(^{27}\) born in Liangzhou 洛州 in the present-day Gansu 甘肅 province, translated it into Chinese, and the Chinese Daoist 道家 mixed down the translation.\(^{27}\)

The next sūtra that was translated was the Mahāyānaśīla 分五品 (T.1425), Mahāyānaśīlaśāstra,\(^{27}\) translated by Buddhābhudda and Faxian 福建, translated large parts of the Mātisūtrasāraśīlaśāstra (Gāthāsāraśīlaśāstra).

---

\(^{28}\) See the biographies of Kumārajīva, Pumaprata, Dharmanāti and Vimalakīrti (Huijuan, T2059.9.330a10-330c14, translated by Sibi, 1968, pp. 69-85). See also the earliest extant catalogue, Sengyou, T2145.55.21a5-21b1 (Buddhāyaśas, Zhu Fuxian and Dharmaśāstra, T113b8-9 (Buddhāyaśas and Zhu Fuxian, Dharmaśāstra, T113b8-9 (Buddhāyaśas and Zhu Fuxian, Dharmaśāstra), translated by Rabas, 1968, pp. 55-96, 85-90).

\(^{27}\) According to Z. Thubaram (1986, vol. 2, p. 73o), Zhu Fuxian was possibly an Indian whose family had lived in China for generations.

\(^{26}\) For more details, see Heiman 2002a, pp. 18-22.

the original disciplinary rules—as one could still find them in India—had to be emphasised. He took the Mālatasamudrakāśikā as a basis. By doing so, Yijing never said that the other vinayas were less valuable. To Yijing, the only important fact was that one followed one, unspotted vinaya. His own preference for the Mālatasamudrakāśikā seems to rely mainly on two facts. First of all, because of his long stay in Nalanda, he had become an expert of the Mālatasamudrakāśikā, and secondly, this Indian vinaya had not yet been spoiled by any Chinese commentators and interpretations. Despite the translation of Yijing, however, the Mālatasamudrakāśikā did not become popular in the Chinese monasteries. Instead, as we will see further, it was the Dharmaparyāśikā that with the help of an imperial edict issued by the Emperor Zhongzong 中宗 (r. 705–710), conquered the whole of China.73

3.3. The Origin of the Northern Vinayas

The above has shown that in China, there were mainly two centres of Vinaya translation: Chang’an (Xian) in the north, and Jiankang (Nanjing) in the south. As for the origin and the original languages of the Indian vinayas translated into Chinese, the information is generally rather scarce. Some scholars have tried to gain some more knowledge by analysing the phonetic renderings used in the translations of these texts. A serious difficulty for this kind of study is the cumulative tradition of standard terms that were passed down from translator to translator and that therefore do not testify the linguistic situation of the text in which they

---

72 Of the Mālatasamudrakāśikā, a Tibetan translation as well as many Sanskrit fragments are extant. For details, see Yayama 1979, pp. 12–33.
74 The fact that the Mālatasamudrakāśikā call themselves “vaidē,” whether to be interpreted as “the original” (Sarvāstivādin) or as “the root” (of other sects) (cf. Edelmaier 2000, pp. 219–220), and the fact that in some texts, the Mālatasamudrakāśikā and the Sarvāstivādin are considered belonging to one and the same tradition, does not imply that there is no difference between the two schools. Although the Sarvāstivādin and the Mālatasamudrakāśikā are similar, they differ in many instances, and therefore the shorter Sarvāstivādin cannot be a summary of the longer Mālatasamudrakāśikā, as it was claimed in the Mahāparinirvāṇa (T.1699, 22.75K-3–6; see also Willemsen, De Roo & Cox 1968, pp. 192–195; Edelmaier 2000, pp. 249–250). On the other hand, the similarities between the two vinayas reveal that, to a certain extent, they developed in a parallel way. For more details, see Heismann 1959, pp. 852–860.
76 Yijing, T2125 34.909B1–23.2.
77 Yijing, T2125 54.205A20–206A4. Yijing compares the steep situation with a deep well, the water of which has been spoiled after a river has overflowed. If a thirsty man wishes to drink of the pure water of the well, he can only do this by endangering his life. Yijing added that this kind of situation would not occur if one only adhered to the vinaya texts themselves and not by the later commentators.
78 It is not impossible that the Empress Wu Zetian (r. 680–705) had in mind using the newly arrived vinayas to her advantage (personal communication of the late Professor Forte, Naples). Yijing was indeed closely linked to the imperial court of Wu Zetian, and after his return from India in 695, he resided in the most important dynamic monastery, the Da Hongfang 大弘坊 in the capital Luoyang. This monastery had been founded by Wu Zetian, and it became a centre of translation and propaganda for the empress. It also had an ordination platform (Forte 1983, p. 695). It is thus not impossible that the empress might have thought to use the Mālatasamudrakāśikā for her own purposes, converting China into a Buddhist state (see Forte 1976, 1992, pp. 219–221). But time was not on her side. Although a Mālatasamudrakāśikā translation (set of procedures) and a vinaya (list of rules and their commentary) for monks had been translated by 705, the translation of the Mālatasamudrakāśikā as a whole was finished only after Wu Zetian's death in 705 (see Yayama 1979, pp. 12–23; Usami 1996, pp. 171–172). Nonetheless, the relation between her imperial court and the use of certain vinaya texts remains an intriguing subject for further research.
appear. 83 Still, an analysis of the Chinese renderings combined to the study of the extant Indian manuscripts can provide strong clues. 84

The first viśeṣa translated into Chinese was the one of the Sarvasatvādins, the prominent school in Northwest India and in Central Asia. 85 Although they once used Northwest Prākṛt (i.e., Gāndhārī), 86 by the time that Kumārajīva made his translations, the language used by the Sarvasatvādins was Buddhist Sanskrit. 87

Of the Dharmaguptakas, it has been argued that they originally used Gāndhārī, gradually turned to Buddhist Sanskrit, and eventually used Sanskrit. 88 Also, the Dharmaguptakas seem to have been prominent in the Gandhāra region. 89 Therefore, since in the fifth century, Gāndhārī was still in use, it is not impossible that the Indian Dharmaguptakasawigya, recited by Buddhāyāsa, is related to the Gāndhārī tradition. 89

The Mahāstāṃghikas are attested mainly in the northern and the central part of the Indian subcontinent. 90 Since they were active in the Gandhāra region, they presumably once used Gāndhārī. 91 However, the most prominent language used by the Mahāstāṃghikas, or at least by the Mahāstāṃghikas-Lokottaravādin, a sub-branch of the Mahāstāṃghikas, seems to be a language in the transitional state from Prākṛt to Sanskrit. 88

As for the Mahāśāskas, attested in Andhra Pradesh, in Panjāb and in Pakistan (Uḍḍiyāna), 92 not a lot is known on the original language of their viśeṣas. Still, at least for the viśeṣa text translated into Chinese, a few scholars have advanced the hypothesis that it was written in Sanskrit. This is based on some preliminary studies of the phonetic renderings, as well as on the fact that the biography of the Kashmirīn translator Buddhāvata says that in his youth in Kashmir, he had a Buddhist master belonging to the Mahāśāsk school. 93 Since in Kashmir, the prominent Buddhist language was Sanskrit, the latter language is put forward as a not improbable guess. 94 In an article on the texts found by Fa-hsin in Sri Lanka, 95 however, J. W. de Jong is doubtful about this hypothesis. He points out that the studies on the phonetic renderings certainly do not give a clear picture, and that the origin of one of the translators cannot be proof enough of the language that he used. In that context, he underlines that Buddhāyāsa too was from Kashmir. He was one of the translators of the Dharmaguptakasawigya, a viśeṣa that must probably was not translated from Sanskrit.

Finally, for the Mīśarāvīnāsasawigya, the situation is comparatively clear. The original text was written in Sanskrit, and, as indicated above, at the time of Vījyā, it was the prominent viśeṣa in the region of Nilāndra. 96

4. THE TRANSLATION OF THE THERAṆĀDA TRADITION

It is clear that the above mentioned translations all are related to the languages of northern Buddhism, that is, Gāndhārī, Buddhist Sanskrit and Sanskrit. Not one extant viśeṣa is related to the Sinhalese Pāli tradition, despite the fact of quite frequent contact between China and Sri Lanka at a time when the Chinese Buddhist community was eagerly looking for as many Indian texts as possible.

4.1 Contact Sri Lanka—China

As is still the case today, the southern or Theravāda tradition was predominant on the island of Sri Lanka at the time of the Chinese Viṃga translations. Contrary to the northern tradition, its texts never reached China via the northern land routes. The language of the original texts
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83 Pulleyblank 1985, p. 87.
84 For more details, see Boucher 1993.
86 Faivre 1989, pp. 441-442; Salomon 1999, p. 171.
88 Vaidemans 1990, pp. 168-172; Chung & Volle 1997, pp. 52-53, 56; Nihisnai 1997, pp. 269-269; on the other hand, is of the opinion that only two linguistic phases can be discerned in the Dharmaguptaka tradition: 1) Gāndhārī; 2) Buddhist Sanskrit. For further details, see Heijman 2002a, pp. 490-492.
89 Salomon 1999, pp. 165-178. Further study however, is needed to determine how important the position of the Dharmaguptakas exactly was (Allen and Salomon 2006, pp. 271-272; Boucher 2000a, pp. 63-69; Lorn 2003, pp. 17-19).
90 A further indication of its Gāndhārī origin, is a reference to the Arapacana syllabary found in the Dharmaguptakasawigya, T.1426.22.3939a14. In all probability, this "syllabary was originally formulated in a Gāndhārī-speaking environment and written in the Kharoṣṭhī script." (Salomon 1990, p. 271).
91 Kieffer-Püls 2000, p. 298.
92 Salomon 1999, p. 171.
94 Kieffer-Püls 2000, p. 298.
is Pali, and its followers are predominantly Hinayanaists. Although, in the first centuries of the spread of Buddhism in China, Sri Lanka was much less known than many other parts of the Indian subcontinent, the Chinese were certainly aware of the existence of a Sinhalese Buddhist community. Apart from the visit of the monk Fa-hian to the island (see above), several other contacts between Sri Lanka and China have been recorded, both in Buddhist texts and in secular historical sources. Maybe the most striking example of obvious contact between the Theravada Sinhalese Buddhist communities and the communities in China is the (second) ordination ceremony of Chinese monks ca. 432. As seen above, the first Chinese monk Zhu Jiejin was ordained in the presence of the bhikkhunis only. This goes against one of the fundamental rules (gurukarma) accepted by the first Indian monk Mahaprajapati as a condition for the creation of a bhikkhunisangha. One of these rules states that a woman should be ordained first in the presence of a bhikkunisangha and then in the presence of a bhikkhunisangha. Most fifth century Chinese vinayas specify that ten mun are required for the first ceremony in the bhikkhunisangha. This procedure has assured the proper and uninterrupted transmission of the rules for women from the time of the Buddha onward. In China, however, it is clear that, originally, the rule had not been followed, since at the time of Zhu Jiejin's ordination, there was no Chinese bhikkhunisangha. This situation led to discussion as mentioned in several biographies of the Tripitaka. It reached its peak in the first half of the fifth century. At that time, in 429, a foreign boat captain named Nantai (南齊), brought several Sinhalese monks to Jiankang, the capital of the Southern Song dynasty. For the first time, a group of fully ordained foreign monks was present in China. Yet, their number was not sufficient, a problem that was solved a few years later when a second group of eleven Sinhalese monks arrived. Consequently, it became possible to offer the Chinese monks a second ordination, this time in the presence of an adequate quorum of fully ordained monks. Afterwards, the discussion on the validity of the Chinese monks' ordination died out. Apart from the Sinhalese delegations that made the second ordination of Chinese monks possible, around the end of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century also other missions from Sri Lanka to Southern China took place. According to the Liaozheng san jie zhi, the emperor Taizong (r. 579–649) sent his envoy to the court of the Chinese Emperor Xiaowu 始武 (r. 457–449) by the king of Sri Lanka who was impressed by the emperor's devotion to Buddhism. He was to present to the Chinese emperor a statue of jade. The Official Histories of the Liang (420–557) and of the Southern Dynasties (420–589), as well as the Guansheng zhi, further mention that the Sinhalese mission arrived at the Chinese court during the 57th year (601) of Emperor An's reign. This implies that the journey must have lasted at least ten years. According to E. Zürcher, it is very improbable. He points out that the long period might be the result of a chronological computation by Chinese historians who wanted to account for the fact that the present was destined for the Emperor Xiaowu (who died in 548), but only arrived during the 57th year. E. Zürcher argues that this artificial calculation is not necessary since
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68 The basic text used at the ordination ceremony is not mentioned in any source. It presumably was a Chinese stele. For a discussion, see Heinemann 2001, pp. 280–282.
69 The northern part of China had less contact with Sri Lanka. According to the Wulue diji, vol. 4, p. 5033, in the beginning of the Tang period (618–907), five Sinhalese monks reached the Northern Wei capital. The monks said that they had traversed the countries of the Western Regions, which means that, contrary to the Sinhalese missions that most probably went to the south of China using the sea route, they had come overland.
70 Compiled by the monk Tan (472–540), T218.15.520a27–29.
74 Yuezhi 76, vol. 6, p. 1962.
75 Huijia, T2059.50.410b2–3. See also Zhang, T2035.49.453a25–25.
76 According to E. Zürcher (1972, vol. 2, p. 571 n. 375), the oldest but no longer extant source that has been the anonymous Jiu Xuan ci zhi (Six Records of Foreign Land, 9th century) also contains the information that Emperor Xiaowu asked for the statue from the king of Sri Lanka. At the time of the Jiu Xuan ci zhi, a work mentioned in Sengcan's catalogue (T2146.55.572), E. Zürcher 1972, vol. 1, p. 152.
even when the present was destined for Xiaowu, the mission can have started many years after 396, the Sinhalese court having no up-to-date information on the death of the Chinese emperor. Further referring to a note in the Official History of the Jin dynasty that says that in 413, Dashi 大師 (Da Shi, also known as 366) sent a tribute of regional products to the Chinese court. E. Zürcher concludes that the year 413 might be the year that the envoy arrived. The statue of jade, four feet and two inches high, was placed in the Wuguan monastery (Wuguan si 武觀寺), an important monastery in the capital Jiankang where many prominent monks such as Zhu Sengqi 孫僧伽 (ca. 300-370) and Zhu Fajia 孫法家 (320-387) had resided. The Liangshi and the Nanshi further mention that besides the jade statue, the envoy also brought ten packages (十載) of texts. It is not clear which texts these might have been.

The period that saw the most extensive contact between the Chinese and the Sinhalese courts was the period between 425 and 435. Not only did the great captain Nandi bring several Sinhalese monks to the Chinese capital Jiankang, the Sinhalese king Mahānāma (reigned 409-431) repeatedly sent products and messages to the Chinese Emperor Wen (reigned 424-453) of the Song dynasty. According to the entry on Sri Lanka in the Official History of the Song dynasty, in the fifth year of the yanqia period of Emperor Wen (428), the Sinhalese king sent a delegation to the Chinese court to pay tribute. Four monasteries offered the emperor two white robes and a statue with an ivory pedestal. There was also a letter in which the king asked for an answer to be sent back to him in the section on Emperor Wen, however, the Liangshi does not mention any tribute paid by Sri Lanka in the fifth year of yanqia, but it mentions such a tribute in the seventh year (430).

Also the Buddhist historian Zhiyan 志玄 (fl. 1258-1269) refers to his Fuzi tangzi 佛祖統記 (Record of the Lineage of the Buddha and Patriarchs) to a Sinhalese tribute mission. He places it in the fifth year of yanqia (428). According to Zhiyan, the Emperor Wen replied to Mahānāma’s letter. He told the Sinhalese king that there were scarcely any Hinayana texts in China and asked the king to send him copies. It is not clear whether or not the king ever received such a request and whether or not he answered it, but the fact that Zhiyan’s text is very late diminishes its credibility on this matter.

The Official Histories of the Song, of the Liang and of the Southern Dynasties further mention that in the twelfth year of yanqia (435), the Sinhalese again sent an envoy to pay tribute. The Liangshi and the Nanshi add that also in 527, a Sinhalese king called Jiade (jiade jiade 伽耶伽耶提婆) sent tribute to China. The letter addressed to the emperor is an almost exact copy of the former king Mahānāma’s letter.

4.2. The Fuli Therasas Tathāgam

At the time of the first contact between the Sinhalese and the Chinese communities, there were two leading monasteries in Sri Lanka: the Abhayagiri Vihāra and the Mahavihara. The Abhayagiri Vihāra was founded by King Vattagamani Abhaya between 29 and 17 BC. It

---
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19 TZO 54:49.34b16-18, 45c17-19.
24 Based on Göbl 1969, p. 224.
25 For details on the maritime relations between Southeast Asia and China, see Zürcher 2002, pp. 30-42.
26 Songlu 97, vol. 8, p. 2384.
27 Trans., men who practice the way.
28 This delegation is also mentioned in the Nanlu 78, vol. 6, p. 1865. The Luanglu 54, vol. 3, p. 805, refers to a delegation in the sixth year of yanqia (429). On this mission, see also Le 1963, pp. 412-413.
became a strong rival of the Mahāvihāra, founded during the reign of Devanampiya Tissa (247–207 BCE). With the support of several kings, the Abhayagiri vihara gradually expanded. In his travel account, the monk Faxian describes the monastery as a very rich place with five thousand monks, receiving the support of the royal house. The Mahāvihāra, according to Faxian, had three thousand monks. He describes it as the second most important monastery, also frequented by the king. He does not tell us about any rivalry between the two monasteries. Not a lot is known about what was particular to the Abhayagiri vihara. Most, if not all their texts have completely disappeared after king Pajalingabhoja (1183–1186) decided to reunify the three Theravada groups of Anuradhapura: the Abhayagiri vihara, the Jetavanavihara, and the Mahāvihāra. The monks of the first two monasteries were re-ordained according to the Mahavihara tradition. Consequently, the Mahāvihāra texts became the only ones to survive, while the Abhayagiri vihara viewpoints are only known from a very small number of quotations in non-Abhayagiri vihara Pali texts.

In fifth and sixth century China, apart from the account of Faxian, no other texts report on the situation of the Sinhalese Buddhist communities. Also on the Pali Theravada tradition as a whole, the Chinese had little information since only a few Pali texts were ever translated into Chinese. Of these, two texts are extant: the Jetavana 432 (T1648, Treatise on the Path to Liberation) and the Shanlan la pipatika 善見地起経 (T1402, “Good for Seeing”) Commentary. In addition, a translation of a Theravada sūtra (T184) by the monk Mahāpāla was mentioned in the catalogues but is not any longer extant. Also the now lost Wudai baojia 维摩诘經 (Sutra of the Five Hundred Vattles) was also translated by Mahāpāla was possibly based on a Pali text.
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104 T208S.51:864a-24-865a12.
105 In the third century, the Sāgaliśkas, later called the  Ājapanabhadravadi, split from the Mahāvihāra. The role of this school has remained obscure (Boecke 1959a, p. 114).
106 Von Hüniger 1996, pp. 22–23. One Pali text, the Saṅkhaṅgañjana, the date of which is uncertain, is sometimes attributed to the Abhayagiri vihara tradition because of the title Ābhagyagiri devavahanäsattva given to its author from Hüniger (1996, p. 203).
107 This seems to be a surmise given to a monk well-versed in Mahāyana texts. See, for example, the Indian monk Gopalakrishna (died 458) who was called Mahāyāna because of his study of Mahāyana texts (Huadi, T2095.50:344b3–4).
108 Von Hüniger 1996, p. 57. In addition, the Saṅgihānaṃjana 僧伽焰焰經 (T1465, 432)

The jetavan dāvan or Vanavamsagga is a manual of the Theravada tradition compiled by a certain Upātissa. The original Pāli text is lost, but the Chinese translation is still extant. It was made by the monk Sanghabhāra 33. 355. 500 in 515.

The Shanlan la pipatika is a partial translation into Chinese of the Mahāvihāra commentary on the Pali Vinaya. The translation was made by the monk Sanghabhāra in 489–499, and shows the influence of many other Chinese traditions. It seems not to have been widely diffused, since the earliest biography works do not even mention it once among the texts studied by the Buddhist masters. It is, however, briefly mentioned as an existing sūtra text in the additional commentary on the vinaya masters in the Gaṇgānūtā

---

Questions of Upātissa, translated in the fifth century, has sometimes been considered as a text based on a Pali original. This hypothesis is now rejected by most scholars (for more details, see Herman, 2004, p. 377).

110 Demmert 1978, p. 291: the reconstruction of the name is uncertain.
111 Along the Melambo River. In the first century AD, Pāni had a very important support from both Indian and Chinese travellers. Because of the winds, these travellers were often obliged to remain in the port for several months. This stimulated a cultural dialogue, particularly between Tainan and India (Tai 1999, Vol. 1, pp. 192–195). See also Rici 1996, pp. 455–456.
112 The Chinese version has been translated by N. R. M. Elara, Soon Tong and Khorstana. Thera under the title The Path of Righteousness by the Arhat Upātissa. Translated into Chinese by the Thiptitha Singhaloka of Famen (Colombo 1961).
113 Sanghabhāra clearly intended to disseminate the Buddhist environment he was living in. He (or his disciples, Upatissak and Hūkaka 1973, p. 441) adopted the text to the Chinese habitus, showing familiarity with the Chinese way of life, particularly with the Dharmaguhaparamita and the Satyakālīparamita. See Herman, 2004.
114 Huainan, Gaoheng zhen (T2025) compiled around AD 500; Daoyuan, Xa jiaozheng zhen (T3060), the final version of which has probably been compiled by Daoyuan’s disciples shortly after his death in 867 (Wagner 1995, pp. 79–80; Zangxie, Song gaoheng zhen (T2069), compiled around 983, and covering the period between Daoyuan’s death and the early Song (Dahlg 1987, p. 168).
115 Still, the work is translated in several catalogues: Pāli Chiang-Mai, T2034.49.52a18–c7, 1984; Senggrand, T2110.53.124a20–23, 42a23–25; Pajalinga, T2145.55.149a22; Yuenong et al., T2147.55.155b23–28; Jingui et al., T2145.55.18a4–5; Daoyuan, T2149.35.202a25–28; 502a23–25, 502b16–17; Jingui, T2151.55.362b21–24; Miaoqiang et al., T2155.55.49a13–15, 49b09–10; Zhuding, T2154.55.585a10–11, 619c21–25, 620a3–5; Weichang, T2157.55.839b06–834a7, 955a25–26, 1043b10–11.
116 The work also figures among the texts preserved in the Xining monastery (Ximing ti xian gong) where Daoyuan was the abbot—according to the monastery catalogue copied by Daoyuan’s disciple in (T2145.55.362b21–24). Cf. Daoyuan’s biography, T2061.50.79b6–791b25, transmitted into English by Wagner 1995, pp. 255–268; see also Forte 1985, pp. 699–701.
Commentary on the Five Hundred Questions on the Essentials of the Dharma, a no longer extant text that, according to an additional note of Daoxuan, is a compilation on many matters ordered by Emperor Wu of the Liang dynasty.

The translator of the Samantapada, Sanghabhadra, is said to be a foreigner, or a man "of the western regions." He translated the text in Guangzhou, in the Zhulin bamboo grove (Vesuban) monastery, together with the Tvamana Senya, who translated the Pali Samantapada as a Mahavibhava text. Its Chinese translation, however, shows a probable Ahayagrivavara connection. This is particularly clear when compared with the famous Sima discussion between the Mahayana and the Abhayagrivavara, namely the debate on the nun Metitty, who is associated with the Abhayagrivavara viewpoint. Such an Abhayagrivavara connection is also put forward with respect to the above-mentioned "Vesuban," which, according to many buddhistologists, might be affiliated to the latter monastery. Since, moreover, the most extensive contact between the Chinese and Sinhalese took place —

116. See Zhangfang, T2054.49.359c19; Daoxuan, T2140.55.369c9.
118. It is interesting to note that this is the same monastery where, according to T2153, a Pali version was translated into Chinese; at around the same period (see note 159).
119. T2054.49.359c9, instead of 356c9.
120. The introductory verses of the Samantapada sense that the work intends to be a Pali version of already existing Sinhala commentaries in order to "make the orthodox opinion of the Mahayana internationally accessible" (von Haiden 1996, p. 105).
122. This debate is the only matter on which we know the viewpoint of the Abhayagrivavara Paiva (von Haiden 1996, p. 22). It discusses a statement in the Pali Paiva that tells us that the nun Metitty (St. Madhavi) falsely accused the venerable Dika Malapatha (St. Daya Malapatha, Karthika) in 2009, p. 233, note 2) of having raped her, a violation of the first precept (which is a definitive exclusion from the Buddhist status of monk or nun). When she later admits to having lied, the Pali Paiva (Vin. vol. 3, p. 182-183), for the monastics that have survived in a Chinese translation, see Heimde (2000a, p. 31-34) from the account of the abbot implied in the Mahayana. The Chinese translation of the Samantapada (T2054.49.359c9) does not refer to the controversy between the Mahayana and the Abhayagrivavara, as it is clear from a passage in the Pali Samanapada (Sp. vol. 3, p. 382-384), where the question is asked what the actual reason of Metitty's expulsion is (see also von Haiden, 1997, p. 87-91; Haiden 1999, p. 86-88, 102-105). The Chinese version of the Samanapada (T1400.84.769c9-769d27) does not refer to the controversy between the Mahayana and the Abhayagrivavara, but it does point to the legal problem concerning Metitty's expulsion. The Chinese text states that she had to be expelled because she herself acknowledged that she had committed a precept offense. This explanation corresponds to the Abhayagrivavara position.

4.3. The Pāli Vinaya

As mentioned in Faxian’s travel account, it was not easy to obtain \textit{vinaya} texts. Still, he finally succeeded in obtaining three \textit{vinaya}. One of these, the \textit{Mahāvihāravagga}, he found in Sri Lanka. Since at that time, \textit{vinaya} matters were a prominent issue for the Sinhalese Theravāda masters, and since Faxian spent five years on the island, it is striking that he never obtained a Pāli \textit{Vinaya} text, nor even mentioned the existence of any \textit{vinaya} discussions. Still, he was well acquainted with both the Abhayagiri vihāra and the Mahāvihāra, the two most important Theravāda monasteries. The fact that Faxian did not acquire any Pāli \textit{Vinaya} text in Sri Lanka does not imply that the Pāli \textit{Vinaya} never reached China. The \textit{Chiu saranāyana}, the catalogue compiled by Senyou around 516, mentions that during the reign of Emperor Wu 武 (483–493) of the Qi 齊 dynasty, a certain monk called Mahāyāna translated two texts in Guangzhou: one entitled \textit{Wu hou hen sheng jiu} 五百本生經 (Sutra of the Five Hundred Jātaka), and the other is a \textit{Theravāda vinaya} text, entitled \textit{Tappī} 他毘梨. Senyou further mentions that the two texts were never presented to the emperor, and were subsequently lost. This explains why the two texts translated by Mahāyāna were never widely known in the Chinese monasteries. A new text had to be presented to the imperial court before it could be diffused. If this presentation did not take place, a text could easily disappear.\footnote{Adikaram 1995, p. 95.}

The question remains, however, why the two texts, and especially the Pāli \textit{Vinaya}, never reached the imperial court. Was it because of a lack of interest in this \textit{vinaya}? At the time that the Pāli \textit{Vinaya} was translated, the \textit{Sarvabuddhavinaya} was firmly established in the south of China, namely as a result of the efforts of the monk Huiyuan 惠遠 (334–417).\footnote{Zürcher 1972, vol. 1, p. 208–219; Tokezawa 1985, vol. 2, pp. 385–389.} The monasteries no longer felt that there was a lack of disciplinary texts, and this feeling might have prevented the spread of yet another \textit{vinaya}. Still, in the fifth century, there was quite an eclectic interest in \textit{vinaya} traditions, and many masters certainly studied more than one text (see further). Moreover, contrary to the Pāli \textit{Vinaya} itself, the partial translation of the commentary on this \textit{vinaya}, did gain some popularity and attracted the attention of the famous \textit{vinaya} master Daoxuan. So, why not the Pāli \textit{Vinaya}? Could there be any connection with the fact that the text was clearly a Hinayāna text? This does not seem plausible since also all the other Chinese \textit{vinayas} used for ordination in the Chinese monasteries are of Hinayāna origin. Yet, at the time that the \textit{vinayas} were translated into Chinese, the Sinhalese monks and nuns were already exclusively Hinayāna followers,\footnote{Wang 1994, p. 175; Kiesler-Pills 2000, pp. 332–368.} while monks and nuns ordained by means of another \textit{vinaya}, were often closer to the Mahāyāna movement.\footnote{Zürcher 1972, vol. 1, pp. 12–15; Wang 1994, p. 175; Kiesler-Pills 2000, pp. 332–368.} Moreover, the Pāli Hinayāna tradition as a whole was not very popular despite travellers such as Faxian who visited Sri Lanka. And even Faxian did not bring Theravāda texts with him. Instead, during his stay in Sri Lanka, he obtained copies of the \textit{Divyāgama},\footnote{Kiesler-Pills 2000, pp. 332–368.} of the \textit{Sammukāyāgama},\footnote{Zürcher 1972, vol. 1, pp. 208–219; Tokezawa 1985, vol. 2, pp. 385–389.} of a “Miscellaneous piṭaka”\footnote{Wang 1994, p. 176; Kiesler-Pills 2000, pp. 332–368.} (cālīgama 伽毘留), and of the \textit{vinayas} of the Mahāsākās.\footnote{Kiesler-Pills 2000, pp. 332–368.} Not one of these

having been approved by the emperor. These are mainly devotional texts, or texts related to miracles (Kun 2000, pp. 686–687).}
texts can be traced back to a Theravāda origin. So even though Faxian stayed in Sri Lanka for about two years, he seems not to have been interested in the Theravāda texts. Noteworthy also is that in the lists of the important schools, so popular in China from the fourth century onwards, the Theravāda tradition never appears. These lists mostly contain five schools, known for their vinaya texts.198 The Pali Vinaya is never mentioned, and seems not to have played any role. It was isolated in Guangzhou, in the south of China. Why did it remain so isolated? Was it because of political events? The *vinaya* was translated during the reign of Emperor Wu (422-493) of the Southern Qi dynasty. It was a quite prosperous period and a time of stability. After the death of Emperor Wu, however, the dynasty quickly went down. Ruthless and incompetent leaders succeeded one another. It was hardly a time to enlarge libraries under imperial sponsorship. This might account for the disappearance of the Pali *Vinaya*. The chaotic period lasted until a skilled general overthrew the Qi in 502 and started his own dynasty, the Liang dynasty (502-557).199

It seems impossible to point out exactly why the Pali *Vinaya* remained so unknown. Maybe it was a mixture of bad luck and bad timing, combined with the general lack of interest in the Pali Hinayana tradition, and aggravated by the fact that there was no longer a real need for *vinaya* texts. The *vinaya* was lost very soon after its translation. Still, at least the awareness that such a copy ever existed made it to Jiankang, since in 518 Sengyou, who resided in the capital, included the *Topkā* in his catalogue, but indicated that it was lost.200

5. THE ECLECTIC USE OF CHINESE VINAYAS

In the above, we have seen how in the course of the fifth century, the Chinese *vinaya* context totally changed. From an imperative need for disciplinary texts, the situation turned into an overwhelming richness. The fifth century saw the translation of all but one of the major *vinayas*, as well as of many additional *vinaya* texts. This, however, also caused some problems. When strictly interpreted, all *vinayas* state that only a harmonious *sangha* (samgrāmansaṅgha) can perform legal procedures, such as ordinations. The terms *samgraha* and *sangha* imply that all monks and nuns who are present in the legal district (*tīrāna*)201 have to attend the ceremony, that there has to be unity in legal procedures and unity in the recitation of the precepts, this is unity in the recitation of the prātimakas at the *pāṭhasaṅgha* ceremony,202 that there have to be enough monks or nuns in order to carry out a formal act in a legally valid way.203 This kind of *sangha* is only possible within one and the same school (*mādhyamikā)*, defined by a common *vinaya*.204 The disciplinary texts clearly leave no place for eclecticism. Still, several cases show that in fifth century China, this does not seem to have been an issue. At least for the translator of the Pali *Samantapāṇḍita* there was no problem to borrow freely from various sources.205 Even more significant is that at the nuns’ ordination ceremony in ca. 433, the participants probably did not belong to the same *vinaya* traditions. Although it is not said on *vinaya* text the ceremony was based, it most probably relied on one of the *vinayas* translated into Chinese.206 The Sinhalaese nuns, on the other hand, in all probability belonged to the Theravāda school. In any case, it is clear that the obligatory presence of ten fully ordained nuns in order to perform a legally valid ordination ceremony received all the

198. Matrify the *Sanghātikāvadha*, the *Dharmakīrti* *sūtras*, the *Kāśyapīya*, the *Mahāthattakārī*, and the *Mahāsthānāṅgikī* (see Lamotte 1958, pp. 593-594).
199. Wang 1996, pp. 172-173. See also note 177.
200. For a detailed overview of the events of the Southern Qi, see Bieberstein 1996, pp. 160-180.
201. See note 158.
202. In order to have a legally valid procedure, any formal act has to be carried out within a well delimited district (*tīrāna*). See note 25.
203. A ceremony held every fortnight and attended by all monks/nuns of the district (*tīrāna*), so that the unity of the order is reaffirmed. At this ceremony the prātimaka (list of precepts) is revised.
205. See also Heß 1939, pp. 219-226; 220-222; 220-222; 220-222; 220-222.
206. Depending on the legal procedure, there should be five, ten or twenty fully ordained participants (see Bieberstein 2002a, part 2, p. 327). After 433, nuns are allowed.
207. Schools (śāla) are defined by the recognition of a common *vinaya*, and thus of a common prātimaka. See Bieberstein 1996, p. 54. “As a rule, monastics belonging to different *Nikayas* do not conduct joint Sanghatasūtras (formal acts). Though they may not always dispute the validity of each other’s ordination, they do not recognize it as beyond dispute either. If there were doubts about the validity, the Sanghatasūtras would be questionable. If the validity of ordination is called into question, the legitimacy of the Sangha is endangered.”
208. See note 130.
209. Before the ceremony could take place, the Sinhalaese nuns had to learn Chinese (T:2053.50.34166).
attention, to the expense of the vinaya tradition of the participants. As for the later ordinations of the Chinese monks and nuns, the vinayas do not seem to be mutually exclusive. The south usually preferred the Sarvastivadin vinaya, while in the north the Mahayana vinaya prevailed, followed by the Dharmaguptaka vinaya. The latter vinaya gradually gained in importance until, in the north, it became the most influential one by the time the northern monk Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667) wrote his commentaries. The south still mainly followed the Sarvastivadin vinaya.

From the seventh century onwards, more and more protest was raised against the use of different vinayas in China. In his Further Biographies of Eminent Monks (Xu guozang chuan 高僧傳), the monk Daoxuan regrets that even though the first ordinations in China were based on the Dharmaguptaka school, one followed in the south the Sarvastivadin school. Also Yijing argues against the eclectic use of vinaya rules and stated that for a Buddhist community it is important to strictly observe only one vinaya. The idea of the exclusive use of one vinaya in the Chinese monasteries was not only based on Buddhist motives, but political reasons also played an important part. When after a long period of fragmentation of the Chinese territory (317–589), the first emperor of the Sui dynasty (589–609) came to power, he was bidding for the favour of the Buddhist community in his struggle to make the country one. At the same time, he also wanted to control the community and its ordinations. The rulers of the early Tang, although less favourable towards Buddhism than the Sui rulers, continued this policy of control. In this context, a unification of the ordination procedures would have been helpful to the court. It is therefore not surprising that when the very active monk Master Dao’an 道安 (654–717), who seemed
to have a good contacts with the Emperor Zhongzong, invoked the help of the imperial court to impose the Dharmaguptaka vinaya all over the country, his request was granted. It was most probably addressed to Zhongzong when the emperor was fully in power between 705 and 710. After the imperial edict was issued, also the south of China used the Dharmaguptaka vinaya.

6. CONCLUSION

The first period of Chinese Buddhism saw an intensive search for disciplinary rules, parallel to the growth of the Buddhist community. This search reached its peak in the beginning of the fifth century when, in a relatively short period, four complete vinayas were translated into Chinese. Once these vinayas were transmitted in China, the Buddhist community gradually became conscious of the advantages of using only one vinaya. This was to be the Dharmaguptaka vinaya. The main reason for this choice seems to have been the firm belief among its defenders that the Dharmaguptaka school was the first to introduce an ordination to China. To follow this school thus assured the Buddhist community of a proper transmission of the ordination since the times of the Buddha. Political reasons also played their role. The fact of having only one ordination tradition probably simplified state control. In the beginning of the eighth century, around the same time that the monk Yijing translated the Mitta-narârâjinânavagga in the hope to purify the Buddhist discipline in China by, as it were, starting all over again, the Dharmaguptaka vinaya was installed by imperial decree as the only right one in China. From that time until today, it has remained the only vinaya active in China. Two major supplements, however, have been added: first, the bodhisattva rules as a Mahayana supplement, and later, the so-called "pure rules" of Baizhang that offer a set of rules for the practical organisation of the Chinese Buddhist monasteries.

These typical Chinese sets of rules, however, have to remain for now the subject of a different study. Together with the vinaya tradition translated from Indian texts, they form the core of the Chinese Buddhist disciplinary rules.

---

111 Daoxuan, T2060.61a–62b. See also Daoxuan's Sifa li changfen dingju wujue zhuan (T1804.40.25a–29): one vinaya (Dharmaguptaka) is the basis, but, if needed, other vinayas can be considered.
112 See note 76.
113 The search for unification of the Chinese empire and the control of the Chinese Buddhist monks are closely intertwined (see Wright 1971, pp. 23–104; Weinstein 1973, p. 263). Monks were required to obtain official ordination certificates, and disciplinary rules were promulgated. See also Wright 1993, p. 68: "It was no accident that the Sui founder chose a Vinaya master as official head of the Buddhist communities of the realm... [his words] expressed his wish that this specialist in the monastic rules should take full responsibility for controlling and disciplining the clergy of the whole realm."
117 See note 51.
118 See note 69.
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INDEX: FROM INDIA TO CHINA


There seems to be a general agreement among scholars that Buddhism entered China by way of the "Silk Road", through western merchants who reported to Han Emperor Wu during the 2nd century BC. However, it was Zhang Qian, who reported to Han Emperor Wu the possibility of another, Asian route, that formed the basis of the "Silk Road". It is known as the "official" road between the Western Regions and China. The "Silk Road" the official road between the Western Regions and China was not known to the Western Regions and China in the 2nd century BC. However, it was Zhang Qian, who reported to Han Emperor Wu the possibility of another, Asian route, that formed the basis of the "Silk Road". The route between China and the Western Regions, especially the silk road, by then, had already been a part of a larger network of routes. The Chinese products of Sichuan, which had been brought there by the way of India, were found together with the goods of southern China, including the products of Sichuan, which had been brought there by the way of India. The Chinese products of Sichuan, which had been brought there by the way of India, were found together with the goods of southern China, including the products of Sichuan, which had been brought there by the way of India.