

distinguish Jains from Ājīvikas, who are shown as sharing ideas or customs. As sharp critics, the Buddhists have emphasized sensitive issues which were fundamental to their opponents, such as the extreme consequences of the theory of non-violence combined with the question of intentionality. They are prompt to denounce the casuistry of the Jain tenets or arguments. As can be seen from stray references given above to non-Pāli Buddhist sources, these points are also those highlighted in the Buddhist perception of Jainism as expressed in Sanskrit or Tibetan texts.

Although the basically polemical attitude of Theravādins has naturally restricted the power of their analyses, confrontation with available Jain texts shows that sound and reliable evidence is clothed in literary garb, that there is a full awareness of Jain technical terminology. The second layer of Pāli exegesis, especially the sub-commentaries written by Dhammapāla, contains valuable material. It seems to reflect a historical context where “Jains” seems to mean rather “Digambaras” than “Śvetāmbaras”. As far as Dhammapāla is concerned, this could be explained by his South Indian milieu, where Digambaras were more numerous than their rivals. But in non-Pāli Buddhist sources — as well as in non-Buddhist sources — there are hints which suggest that Digambaras were also the main, if not the only, target, as if the Śvetāmbara tradition were negligible. This fact has still to be explained.

Nalini Balbir

The Legend of the Establishment of the Buddhist Order of Nuns in the Theravāda Vinaya-Pitaka

Even the Buddhist world has not remained unaffected by the growing awareness of the position of women, and Western Buddhist groups in particular have found it necessary to discuss the attitude of Buddhism to the position of women in society. Clarification of the attitude of early Buddhists towards women, and especially of the position accorded to nuns in the early Buddhist community, may well be expected from a detailed examination of the Vinaya-piṭaka. This book of the discipline of the Order rules on many questions regarding the daily life of monks and nuns of the time and also contains much information relating to cultural history. Passages which include references to or indeed exclusively refer to nuns shed light on the attitude towards women in early Buddhism.

Apart from the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga, which contains those rules of the Pāṭimokkha that only apply to nuns as well as their histories and the relevant commentaries, there are few passages in the Vinaya-piṭaka which specifically relate to women. However, an examination of those passages in the Khandhaka reveals much which renders a consistent evaluation of the position of women in early Buddhism more difficult. In this paper the first section of the tenth chapter of the Cullavagga (Cv X.1 = Vin II 253–56) will be examined for direct and indirect statements regarding the position of women. In this section the events

This is an English translation by Marianne Rankin of the essay “Die Legende von der Einrichtung des buddhistischen Nonnenordens im *Vinaya-Piṭaka* der Theravādin” published in *Studien zur Indologie und Buddhismuskunde, Festgabe des Seminars für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde für Professor Dr. Heinz Bechert*, Reinhold Grünendahl, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, and Petra Kieffer-Pülz, eds. (Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 1993), pp. 151–70. The essay has not been revised, but the author has appended a list of additional publications which bear on the subject. Ed.

leading to the establishment of the Buddhist Order of nuns are described. Within this framework, the eight special rules for nuns (*garudhamma*) were laid down. These were to be accepted by every woman before her entry into monastic life. In addition, this passage contains sayings of the Buddha about women and their influence on Buddhist doctrine.

At the beginning of the first section of the tenth chapter of the Cullavagga, the events immediately preceding the establishment of the Buddhist Order of nuns are described. In general terms these are as follows: the foster mother (and aunt) of the Buddha, Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī, is the first woman to ask the Buddha to permit the acceptance of women into the Order in principle.¹ The Buddha does not give his consent to this request of Mahāpajāpatī, which she repeats three times.²

¹Vin II 253 (Cv X.1.1): *sādhū bhante labheyya mātuḡāmo tathāgatappavedite dhammavinaye agārasmā anagāriyaṃ pabbajjan ti* (“It would be good, sir, if women could leave home for homelessness in the *dhamma* and *vinaya* expounded by the Tathāgata”). The term *pabbajjā* here is to be taken merely as a contrast to the worldly life, not in the sense of a technical term for lower ordination. In the *Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavācānā* (Schmidt 1993, 3a1), however, the terms *pravrajyāṃ upasampadaṃ* are used at this point.

²Vin II 253 (Cv X.1.1): *alaṃ Gotamī mā te rucci mātuḡāmassa tathāgatappa-vedite dhammavinaye agārasmā anagāriyaṃ pabbajjā ti* (“Enough, Gotamī, let it not please you for women to leave home for homelessness in the *dhamma* and *vinaya* expounded by the Tathāgata”). Thus it is not an explicitly negative answer by the Buddha, but rather that he advises Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī against her request — without giving a reason. Similarly *mā rucci/mā rucittha* is used in Vin II 198 (Cv VII.3.16): *alaṃ Devadatta, mā te rucci saṃghabhedo, garuko kho Devadatta saṃghabhedo ti* and in Vin I 150 (Mv III.11.6): *māvasmantānaṃ saṃghabhedo rucitthā ti* (cf. Also Hinüber, 1968, section 260). — Sp 1290f. comments on the passage of the Cullavagga referred to here: *kāmaṃ honti kilamētvā pana anekakkhattuṃ yācena anuññātaṃ pabbajjaṃ dukkhaṃ laddhā ayaṃ amhehī ti sammā paripālessantī ti garukaṃ karvā anujānitukāmo paṭikkhipati* (“[The Enlightened One] instills respect [for the Pabbajjā, thinking]: ‘The [women are] eager [to receive the Pabbajjā] but are in want [of it]. They will observe the Pabbajjā very carefully, which is permitted [by me] only after much petitioning, [because the women think]: ‘This Pabbajjā was hard to attain for us!’ [With these thoughts the

Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī, although evidently much grieved, is not completely discouraged. She cuts her hair off, dresses in a robe, and with other women of the Sakya clan, follows the Buddha, who has meanwhile moved on to Vesālī.³ There Ānanda observes her piteous state and questions her, so she explains the situation to him.⁴ Thereupon Ānanda himself takes the matter up. He too expresses Mahāpajāpatī’s wish three times to the Buddha, but in vain. Later, however, by skilfully steering the conversation⁵ he draws from the Buddha the admission that in principle women are capable of attaining Enlightenment,⁶ and by alluding to the many services which Mahāpajāpatī rendered the Buddha in his youth, Ānanda manages to get the Buddha to agree in principle to

Enlightened One] who wishes to permit [the Pabbajjā] rejects it.”).

³This passage is omitted in the *Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavācānā*; there Ānanda speaks to Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī just after she has left the Buddha.

⁴In the Pāli (Vin II 254) Gotamī says “the Enlightened One does not permit” (*na bhagavā anujānāti*) and in the *Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavācānā* (Schmidt 1993, 3b4), “women do not attain” (*na labhate māṭṭrāmaḥ*) is said.

⁵After his direct request has failed, Ānanda thinks, (Cv X.1.3 = Vin II 254): *yan nūnāhaṃ aññena pi pariyāyena bhagavantam yāceyyaṃ* (“What if I were to ask the Enlightened One in a different way”). The portyal in the Cullavagga thus implies intentional manipulation of the Buddha by Ānanda. It is not clear, however, whether the reproaches made to Ānanda during the first council relate to this deliberate manipulation (Cv XI.1.10 = Vin II 289): *idam pi te āvuso Ānanda dukkaṭaṃ yaṃ tvaṃ mātuḡāmassa tathāgatappavedite dhammavinaye pabbajjaṃ ussukkaṃ akāsi* (“This too is a *dukkāṭa* [mis-demeanor] on your part, that you made such an effort to further women in the *dhamma* and *vinaya* expounded by the Tathāgata”). — In the *Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavācānā* (Schmidt, 1993, 4a1/2), Ānanda only asks the Buddha once for his agreement; the description of how Ānanda steers the conversation another way is entirely absent.

⁶Vin II 254 (Cv X.1.3) *bhabbo Ānanda mātuḡāmo tathāgatappavedite dhamma- vinaye agārasmā anagāriyaṃ pabbajjivā sotāpattiphalaṃ pi sakadāgāmi- phalaṃ pi anāgāmi-phalaṃ pi arahattaṃ pi sacchikātun ti* (“Ānanda, when women leave home for homelessness in the *dhamma* and *vinaya* expounded by the Tathāgata, they are able to realise the fruit of entry into the stream, the fruit of once returner, the fruit of non-returner and [the state of an] arhat”). — This passage is missing in the *Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavācānā*.

the admission of Mahāpajāpatī — and thus of women in general — into the Buddhist Order.⁷

The acknowledgement that women are capable of attaining Enlightenment is fundamental for a definition of the position of women in early Buddhism. It means that in this respect the Buddha regarded men and women as equal.⁸ This assessment may also have been decisive for the Buddha's assent to the establishment of an Order of nuns.⁹ Gustav Roth puts it as follows:¹⁰ “The existence of such a view is of fundamental importance for the existence of an Order of Buddhist nuns.”

The agreement to the establishment of the nuns' Order was not given unconditionally. This may be deduced from the further course of events described in this section of the Cullavagga. Only if Mahāpajāpatī is prepared to follow the eight *garudhammas* (literally, “important

⁷In contrast, the course of events in the *Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavācānā* (Schmidt 1993, 4a1-6a3) is as follows: Ānanda only asks the Buddha once to grant admission to women into the Buddhist Order. The Buddha answers *mā te ... rocatām* (Pāli: *mā te rucci*) as in the Pali version and gives as the reason for his answer that the *dhamma* and *vinaya* would not last long (no time period is given here!) if women obtain the Pabbajjā and Upasampadā. The comparison of women to diseases follows this (see below) and only then comes the specification of the eight *garudhammas* to be observed by women.

⁸Cf. also Vajirarañānavarorasa, Vol. I, p. 142.

⁹Cf. Horner, 1930, p. 103; cf. Pitzer-Reyl, 1984, p. 19, and cf. Heng-Ching Shih 1991, p. 84. It should be noted here, however, that the attainment of Śrotāpanna rank is not synonymous with the attainment of the lowest grade of the Buddhist monastic path to salvation, as Jens-Peter Laut 1991 (p. 268 and p. 266, n. 55) evidently assumes. In this regard, the text examined by Laut should be checked again to determine whether it does in fact represent the ancient Turkish version of the legend of the establishment of the Buddhist Order of nuns.

¹⁰BhīVin (Mā-L), p. xxxi.

rules”) may she (thereby) belong to the Order.¹¹ Although these eight *garudhammas* serve not only as admission criteria but also as rules to be observed for life by every nun,¹² in the Pāli Vinaya¹³ they are not connected with the Bhikkhunīpāṭimokkha. At the same time, in seven *garudhammas* there are parallels either in words or in content with the Pācittiya section of the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga.¹⁴ As will be explained below, it is possible that it was due to later editing by monks, that a list of the rules that seemed to them most important should be juxtaposed to the eight Pārājika rules applying to nuns.¹⁵ As regards the grade of penalty, the *garudhammas* are on a par with the Saṃghādisesa offences. This is shown by the content of the fifth *garudhamma* (see below). Furthermore, the content of passages in which monks are mentioned in

¹¹Vin II 255 (Cv X.1.4.): *sace Ānanda Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī aṭṭha garudhamme paṭigaṇhāti sā 'v' assā hotu upasampadā*, and Vin II 257 (Cv X.2.2.): *yadaggena Ānanda Mahāpajāpatigotamiyā aṭṭha garudhammā paṭiggahitā, tad eva sā upasampannā ti*.

¹²This is expressed in the sentence following each *garudhamma* (Cv X.1.4 = Vin II 255): *ayam pi dhammo sakkatvā garukatvā mānetvā pūjetvā yāvajīvam anatikkamanīyo* (“This rule is to be respected, honoured, esteemed and observed for life and must not be broken”).

¹³Gustav Roth (BhīVin(Mā-L), pp. xxixf.) has been able to establish that the position of the section within the Vinaya traditions containing the *garudhammas* is approximately the same across the various Buddhist schools: in the Pāli Vinaya-piṭaka, in Fa-Hsien's translation of the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya, in the Tibetan version of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, and in the *Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavācānā*. He thus assumes that the direct connection between the *garudhammas* and the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga found in the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin Vinaya is artificial, diverging from the arrangement in an “original” version.

¹⁴Cf. also BhīPr, pp. 8, 118. This will be examined in more detail when *garudhamma* 5 is considered below.

¹⁵It is noteworthy that there are thus eight Pārājika rules, eight *garudhammas* and — in so far as one can include the *garudhammas* as a category of misdemeanor alongside the other classes of offence of the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga — eight categories of offence for nuns. Thus things are evened up, in that the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga has no Aniyata section and thus contains one category of offence less than the Bhikkhuvibhaṅga.

connection with transgression against the *garudhammas* leads at least to equating the *garudhammas* with the Saṃghādisesa offences. One of the attributes a monk must possess in order to be allowed to instruct nuns is, according to Pācittiya 21 of the Bhikkhuvibhaṅga,¹⁶ that he should not have offended against a *garudhamma*. Here the *garudhammas* listed in the Cullavagga, which are applicable only to nuns, cannot be meant. Probably, as Horner says,¹⁷ the Saṃghādisesa rules are meant, for the relevant passages of the Mahāvagga and the Cullavagga dealing with monks who have transgressed the *garudhammas*, mention *parivāsa*,¹⁸ a kind of trial period which constitutes part of the punishment for monks who have committed a Saṃghādisesa offence.¹⁹

Garudhamma 1 requires “the complete subordination of nuns to monks”.²⁰ The sequence of the eight rules specific to nuns begins with a stipulation which makes it quite clear that a nun is always beneath a monk in social rank. “A nun, even if she has been ordained for a hundred years, is to make a respectful [verbal] greeting, to stand up, to make the greeting with palms laid together and to carry out the acts of

¹⁶Vin IV 51: *na ... garudhammaṃ ajjhāpannapubbo hoti.*

¹⁷Cf. *BD* IV, p. 66, n. 1.

¹⁸Vin I 49: *sace upajjhāyo garudhammaṃ ajjhāpanno hoti parivāsāraho ...*; Vin I 52: *sace saddhivihāriko garudhammaṃ ajjhāpanno hoti parivāsāraho ...*; Vin II 226: *sace upajjhāyo garudhammaṃ ajjhāpanno hoti parivāsāraho.* The equation of the Saṃghādisesa rules of the monks and the *garudhammas* of the nuns is particularly clear in the two following passages: Vin I 143: *idha pana bhikkhave bhikkhu garudhammaṃ ajjhāpanno hoti parivāsāraho* (“But here, O monks, a monk has transgressed against a *garudhamma*, and has thus become one who deserves *parivāsa*”), and parallel to that, Vin I 144: *idha pana bhikkhave bhikkhunī garudhammaṃ ajjhāpannā hoti mānattārahā* (“But here, O monks, a nun has transgressed against a *garudhamma*, and has thus become one who has deserved *mānatta*”). Buddhaghosa (Sp, p. 1069) also expounds this passage in this way: *garudhammaṃ ajjhāpanno hoti parivāsāraho, mūlāya paṭikassanāraho hoti, mānattāraho abbhānāraho, saṅgho kammaṃ kattukāmo hoti.*

¹⁹The grade of penalty is explained in detail in Vin III 112 (in the word-for-word commentary on Saṃghādisesa 1 of the Bhikkhuvibhaṅga).

²⁰Thus BhīPr, p. 118.

homage to a monk, even if he has only been ordained that day.”²¹ Although it can be established that the wording of this *garudhamma* is not very close to that of Pācittiya 94 of the Bhikkhuvibhaṅga (Vin IV 343),²² a close correlation in content can nonetheless be perceived. At that point in the Bhikkhuvibhaṅga it is stated that a nun is not permitted to sit in the presence of a monk without having asked his permission. The *garudhamma* examined here thus goes further than Pācittiya 94, as it appears that a nun who is seated must stand up when a monk approaches, in order to make the necessary gestures of respect. At the same time, Cv VI.6.5 (Vin II 162) says that women — along with nine other groups of people — are *not* to be greeted by monks (*mātuḡāmo avandiyo*). Nuns, on the other hand, only have the Buddha’s permission to withhold, by means of a *daṇḍakamma*,²³ the respect otherwise due to a monk in exceptional cases (namely if a monk has behaved improperly towards an individual nun or to the Bhikkhuvibhaṅga).²⁴

In this context, the further course of the narrative in the *Cullavagga* is interesting. There it is recounted that Mahāpajāpatī — again through the mediation of Ānanda — asks the Buddha to rescind *garudhamma* 1 and to permit the main criterion of greeting, with the appropriate actions, between monks and nuns to be seniority rather than sex.²⁵ The Buddha, however, vehemently rejects this suggestion. “That is

²¹Vin II 255: *vassasatupasampannāya bhikkhuniyā tadahupasampannassa bhikkhuno abhivādanaṃ paccuṭṭhānaṃ añjalikammaṃ sāmīcikammaṃ kātabbhaṃ.* In the *Bhikkhunī-Karmavācānā* (Schmidt 1993) this *garudhamma* is placed last (see 6a1/2).

²²Vin IV 343: *yā pana bhikkhunī bhikkhussa purato anāpucchā āsane nisīdeyya, pācittiyān ti.* Cf. also BhīPr, p. 118.

²³Description of the implementation of a *daṇḍakamma* in Vin I 84 (Mv I.57).

²⁴Vin II 261f. (Cv X.9.1): *avandiyo so bhikkhave bhikkhu bhikkhunīsāṃghena kātabbo ti.* Cf. also Vajirarañānavarorasa, 1983, p. 264.

²⁵Vin II 257f. (Cv X.3): *sādhu bhante bhagavā anujāneyya bhikkūnañ ca bhikkhunīnañ ca yathāvuddhaṃ abhivādanaṃ paccuṭṭhānaṃ añjalikammaṃ sāmīcikammaṃ ti.*

impossible, Ānanda.... Ānanda, the adherents of other religious communities, whose *dhmma* is badly expounded, will not greet women with respect ..., how then can the Tathāgata prescribe a respectful greeting of women?"²⁶ Thereupon he lays down that a monk who shows respect to a nun commits a *dukkāṭa* offence.²⁷ It emerges from this passage that the Buddha definitely regarded himself, and the Order he founded in the context of his wider social milieu and in particular in relation to the other religious communities existing at that time.²⁸ At the same time this *garudhamma* shows that at least some of the traditional ideas of the relations between the sexes were taken over into the life in the Buddhist Order, for in Asian countries the manner and sequence of greeting are important etiquette, reflecting the social structure.²⁹

Garudhamma 2 reads, "A nun shall not spend the rainy season in a residential district where there is no monk."³⁰ Pācittiya 56 of the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga (Vin IV 313) is identical to *garudhamma* 2. The definition of *abhikkhuko nāma āvāso* in the word for word commentary on this Pācittiya rule also contains a reason for the prescription: *na sakkā hoti ovādāya vā saṃvāsāya vā gantum*: "It is not possible to go for instruction or *saṃvāsa*".³¹ *saṃvāsa* means "living together" and as a

²⁶Vin II 257, 258: *aṭṭhānam etaṃ Ānanda anavakāso ime hi nāma Ānanda aññatitthiyā durakkhātadhammā mātuḡāmassa abhivādanaṃ ... na karissanti, kim aṅga pana tathāgato anujānissati mātuḡāmassa abhivādanaṃ ... ti.*

²⁷As the term *dukkāṭa* is used as the designation of an offence here, it may be assumed that this rule was not laid down until after the closing of the Pāṭimokkha (cf. Oldenberg's introduction to Vin I, p. xx).

²⁸A further example of this is the legend of the establishment of the Uposatha ceremony in Vin I 101-104 (Mv II.1-3). Here too the Buddha — at the suggestion of King Bimbisāra — takes his bearings from the adherents of other religious communities who meet at periodic intervals to make their teachings known.

²⁹Thus also Horner, 1930, p. 121.

³⁰Vin II 255: *na bhikkhuniyā abhikkhuke āvāse vassaṃ vasitabbaṃ*. — This *garudhamma* is placed third in the *Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavācanā* (see Schmidt 1993, 5a2/3).

³¹Buddhaghosa (Sp, p. 938) explains this: *saṃvāsāya ti uposathapavāraṇa-*

technical term in the Vinaya-piṭaka "the community which carries out legal action together, recites together and has the same instruction."³² Consequently *garudhamma* 2 is closely connected to *garudhamma* 3 (see below). During the rainy season, which monks like nuns are to spend at a fixed place, the nuns will be under the control of monks;³³ however, at the same time they will be guaranteed male protection.

Garudhamma 3 states that twice a month a nun is to ask for two rulings from the Order of monks, one regarding the Uposatha day and the other about monks coming to offer instruction.³⁴ This *garudhamma* is in complete agreement with Pācittiya 59 of the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga (Vin IV 315). The nuns were obliged to ask the monks for information about the Uposatha ceremony as the exact date was determined by the monks.³⁵

pucchanatthāya: "For *saṃvāsa* is: for the purpose of asking [the date of] Uposatha and Pavāraṇā." For further information Buddhaghosa refers to the passage of the Pācittiya-rules in the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* which relates to the instruction of the nuns.

³²Thus in Vin III 28: *saṃvāso nāma ekakammaṃ ekuddeso samasikkhātā, eso saṃvāso nāma. so tena saddhiṃ n' atthi, tena vuccati asaṃvāso ti*: "Living together means: common legal procedure, common recitation and the same instruction. One refers to as *asaṃvāso* a person with whom this is not the case."

³³Cf. also Pitzer-Reyl, 1984, p. 26.

³⁴Vin II 255: *anvaddhamāsaṃ bhikkhuniyā bhikkhusaṃghato dve dhammā paccāsiṃsitabbā uposathapucchakaṃ ca ovādūpasamkamaṇā ca*. In the *Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavācanā* this *garudhamma* only states that the nuns are to ask for the assignment of instruction every fortnight. The Uposatha ceremony is not mentioned there (*bhikṣuṇyā Ānanda bhikṣoḥ sakāsād* [sic] *anvaddhamāsam avavādānuśāsānī paryeṣitavyā*). Here this *garudhamma* is placed second (see Schmidt 1993, 5a1/2).

³⁵Barua, 1966, p. 77, assumes that the nuns were *unable* to set the date. However, Barua does not give proofs in support of this assertion. It may be concluded from the further course of the description in the *Cullavagga* that the recitation of the Pāṭimokkha was completely taken over by the nuns shortly after the setting down of the *garudhammas* (Cv X.6.1-3 = Vin II 259,260; see also Mv II.36.1 = Vin I 135). Thus the nuns exercised their own administration of justice within their Saṃgha (cf. also Pitzer-Reyl, 1984,

The instruction given to the nuns, the main subject of which was the *garudhammas*,³⁶ changed over time. At first, the whole Bhikkhunī-saṃgha visited the monks in order to receive instruction. However, mistrust by “the people” soon led to only two or three nuns at a time being allowed to visit a monk, who had been designated by the Bhikkhusaṃgha as *bhikkhunovādaka* (“instructor of nuns”), for this purpose (Cv X 9.4 = Vin II 263f.). Monks were forbidden to enter the nuns’ area (*bhikkhunūpassaya*) to give instruction. This may be concluded from Pācittiya 23 of the Bhikkhuvibhaṅga (Vin IV 56). During their instruction the monks questioned the nuns as to whether they had kept the *garudhammas*, checking that they had maintained the discipline.³⁷

Garudhamma 4 and Pācittiya 57 of the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga (Vin IV 314) describe the *pavāraṇā* ceremony³⁸ for nuns: “At the end of the rainy season a nun shall satisfy both orders in three respects: by that which is heard, seen and suspected.”³⁹ According to the description in the *Cullavagga*, at first nuns did not perform this ceremony at all. Then they performed it only within their order and later, in a third move, the complete order of nuns performed the *pavāraṇā* in front of the order of monks. As this caused trouble in the Bhikkhusaṃgha, the Buddha decreed that a *pavāraṇā* was first to be completed in the nun’s order. On the following day a nun appointed as spokeswoman by the

p. 27).

³⁶Vin IV 315 *ovādo nāma aṭṭha garudhammā*. Stipulations regarding the carrying out of the instruction of nuns are contained in Pācittiya 21-23 of the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* (Vin IV 49-57). Cf. BhīPr, p. 122.

³⁷Pitzer-Reyl, 1984, p. 27, sees here “a further instrument of control” over the nuns.

³⁸Detailed regulations for this ceremony for nuns in Cv X.19 (Vin II 275f.); the regulations concerning this for monks are in Mv IV.1.14 (Vin I 159f.).

³⁹Vin II 255: *vassaṃ vutthāya bhikkhuniyā ubhatosaṃghe tīhi thānehi pavāretabbam dīṭṭhena vā sutena vā parisāṅkāya vā*. – Cf. Hinüber 1968, pp. 157f., section 147. This *garudhamma* is the only one which is in the same place in the *Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavācānā* (see Schmidt, 1993, 5a3/4/5) and in the Pāli tradition.

Bhikkhunīsaṃgha was to go with the Bhikkunīsaṃgha to the Bhikkhusaṃgha and was to carry out the *pavāraṇā* ceremony again (Cv X.19=Vin II 275f.) in front of the Bhikkhusaṃgha. Before that, the nuns had asked each other to say whether they had seen, heard or merely suspected any offence. On the following day these proceedings were repeated in front of the order of monks. The nuns’ spokeswoman asked the monks to voice their objections.⁴⁰ The monks did not ask for objections from the nuns. Thus the nuns were controlled by two authorities, the monks only by one.

Garudhamma 5 stipulates that nuns who offend against a *garudhamma* must perform 14 days of *mānatta* in front of both orders.⁴¹ This *garudhamma* is the only one of the eight *garudhammas* for which there is no equivalent, either literal or in content, in the Pācittiya section of the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga. However, *garudhammas* 2, 3, 4 and 7 correspond literally to Pācittiyas 56, 59, 57 and 52 of the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga. There is a contradiction here within the Vinaya regulations as the penalty for a Pācittiya offence does not include the imposition of *mānatta*,⁴² which is part of the penalty designated for a Saṃghādisesa offence.⁴³

It is also noticeable here that within the series of the eight rules (*garudhammas*), seven regulations delineate the characteristics of these offences, and one rule (*garudhamma* 5) merely defines the penalty. In the categories of offence in the Pāṭimokkha the penalty is defined either in each rule itself (Pārājika),⁴⁴ or at the end of the category of offence in question (Saṃghādisesa), or in the commentary to the rules

⁴⁰Cf. BhīPr, p. 123.

⁴¹Vin II 255: *garudhammaṃ ajjhāpannāya bhikkhuniyā ubhatosaṃghe pakkhamānattaṃ caritabbam*. In the *Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavācānā* (see Schmidt, 1993) this *garudhamma* is placed seventh (5b4/5, 6a1).

⁴²An offence against one of the Pācittiya rules requires a simple confession.

⁴³Here in *garudhamma* 5 it is not a matter of *parivāsa*. Nuns, as opposed to monks, are not obliged to complete a *parivāsa* in the case of a Saṃghādisesa offence (cf. also *BD* IV, p. 192, n. 2).

⁴⁴Cf. Hecker, 1977, p. 93.

(Nissaggiya-Pācittiya, Sekhiya); or it may emerge from the designation of the offence itself (Pācittiya, Pāṭidesanīya). Further rules contain no penalty (Adhikaraṇa-Samatha), or the penalty is not pre-determined (Aniyata). This inconsistency within the Vinaya regulations can be judged as an indication that the compilation of the eight *garudhammas* recorded in the *Cullavagga* does not stem from an original conception, but is the result of a development. Accordingly it is possible that the compilation of the *garudhammas* which we have before us today is more recent than the rules corresponding to the *garudhammas* in the Pācittiya section of the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga*.

Garudhamma 6 contains the two most important procedural differences between nuns and monks in bestowing the *Upasampadā*: “After having obeyed the six precepts for two years, a *Sikkhamānā* must request *Upasampadā* from both orders.”⁴⁵ Only women are subject to the condition of a two year probationary period,⁴⁶ and the condition that *Upasampadā* must be taken twice, with consent from both the nuns’ and the monks’ Orders.⁴⁷ This *garudhamma* expresses the dependence of

⁴⁵Vin II 255: *dve vassāni chasu dhammesu sikkhitasikkhāya sikkhamānāya ubhatosaṃghe upasampadā pariyesitabbā*. This *garudhamma* is placed first (4b5, 5a1) in the *Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavācānā* (see Schmidt, 1993), which makes sense. In this tradition the point is only that a woman has to request both the *Pabbajjā* and the *Upasampadā* from the monks; a two year probationary period is not mentioned (*bhikṣubhyaḥ sākāsād* [sic] *Ānanda māṭṭgrāmeṇa pravrajyopasampad bhikṣuṇībhāvaḥ pratikāṃṣitavyaḥ*). In content, Pācittiyas 63 and 64 of the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga* (Vin IV 319 and 321) correspond to the first part of this *garudhamma*. Pācittiya 63 rules that a nun who takes into the Order a *Sikkhamānā* who has not been instructed in the six precepts for two years commits a Pācittiya offence. Pācittiya 64 adds the extra condition that a *Sikkhamānā* must be approved by the Order.

⁴⁶Admission to this probationary period is also formalised by a legal act (*kamma*), as may be concluded from the history of Pācittiya 63 of the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga* (Vin IV 318f.; cf. BhīPr, p. 137).

⁴⁷The progress of a woman up to the attainment of nun’s status is thus as follows: (1) A lay member (*upāsikā*) becomes a *Sāmaṇerī* through the *Pabbajjā*. (2) As soon as a *Sāmaṇerī* is 18 years old, she may ask for permission from the Order of nuns, to begin the two year probationary period. The completion of the probationary period is the prerequisite for admission to

the Order of nuns on the Order of monks particularly clearly, as it guaranteed the influence of the monks on the admission of a woman to the Buddhist Order. The final decision whether to receive a woman into the Buddhist Order lay with the monks.

The six precepts to be obeyed by the *Sikkhamānā* during the probationary period correspond in content to four of the five *sīlā*⁴⁸ to be adhered to by lay members: to refrain from killing living creatures, from theft, from falsehood, and from the consumption of intoxicating drink. In addition the *Sikkhamānā* was not to be unchaste or to eat at the wrong time.⁴⁹

It is remarkable at this point that the Buddha, at the very moment of granting the establishment of a nuns’ Order, uses a term (*sikkhamānā*) without giving any further explanation, although he could not possibly have used it before. The procedure by which a woman became a *Sikkhamānā* and the rules she was to obey during this time are described in the history of Pācittiya 63 in the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga*, but not at this point in the *Cullavagga*. So one may presume that this particular *garudhamma* stems from the time when the Buddhist Order of nuns was already a permanent part of the Buddhist community. It is possible that after the death of the Buddha there was a tendency within

the *Upasampadā*. Now the *Sāmaṇerī* is given the title *Sikkhamānā*. If she breaks any of the six precepts during the probationary period, then (2) begins all over again. (3) After completion of the probationary period the *Sikkhamānā* asks the Order of nuns for *Upasampadā*. (4) After *Upasampadā* by the Order of nuns, she is taken by all the nuns to the Order of monks, where she (or rather another nun on her behalf) requests *Upasampadā* again. Only after the Order of monks has given her *Upasampadā*, is she a fully-fledged member of the nuns’ Order, a *Bhikkhunī*.

⁴⁸Cf. also Nyanatiloka, 1983, p. 209.

⁴⁹These six precepts are listed in Pācittiya 63 of the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga* (Vin IV 319). They are formulated as follows: *pārātipātā veramaṇiṃ dve vassāni avītikkammasamādānaṃ samādiyāmi, adinnādānā veramaṇiṃ ... samādiyāmi, abrahmacariyā veramaṇiṃ ... samādiyāmi, musāvādā veramaṇiṃ ... samādiyāmi, surāmerayaṃ jāpamādaṭṭhānā veramaṇiṃ ... samādiyāmi, vikālabhojanā veramaṇiṃ ... samādiyāmi*. Cf. also Horner, 1930, pp. 138ff.

the community of nuns to abolish this extra probationary period for nuns. At this, the more conservative members of the order may have felt compelled to give added weight to its institution by giving the ruling in the *garudhammas* the authority of the Buddha's words.

Garudhammas 7 and 8 refer to personal relationships between monks and nuns.

Garudhama 7: "A nun is in no way allowed to insult or disparage a monk."⁵⁰ This *garudhamma* corresponds to Pācittiya 52 of the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga (Vin IV 309). Here, according to Horner,⁵¹ reference is made to the conflict between the "group of six nuns" and Upāli, described in the history of Pācittiya 52 of the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga. Thus it is most probable that this *garudhamma* is of a later date when the Order of nuns already existed. On the other hand, the sequence of the origin of individual parts of the Vinaya-piṭaka cannot be clearly determined. Thus, if Oldenberg is correct in his assumption that the histories of the individual rules in the Pāṭimokkha originated at roughly the same time as the *Mahāvagga* and *Cullavagga*, then Horner's argument is invalid. The result of Horner's reflections can nevertheless be viewed as correct, because insulting or disparaging behaviour toward monks by nuns would not have required an extra ruling in the Pāṭimokkha if it had already been regulated in the *garudhammas*, which according to tradition had been laid down previously. This is particularly unlikely given the fact that an offence against a *garudhamma* entails a considerably harsher punishment (namely fourteen days *mānatta*) than neglect of a Pācittiya rule.

Garudhamma 8: "From today, for nuns, speaking⁵² to monks is

⁵⁰Vin II 255: *na bhikkhuniyā kenaci pariyaēyena bhikkhu akkositabbo paribhāsitaḥ*. Horner, 1930, points out that there is no rule for monks which forbids them to insult nuns. Insulting a nun by a monk is only mentioned in *Anguttara-nikāya* V, pp. 70f. (cf. Horner, 1930, p. 126 and note 2), where it is given as one of ten reasons for suspension from participation in the recitation of the Pāṭimokkha.

⁵¹1930, p. 158.

⁵²Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, 1885, p. 324, n. 4. translate *vacanapatha* by

The Legend of the Establishment of the Buddhist Order of Nuns 57 forbidden, but for monks, speaking to nuns is not forbidden."⁵³ This *garudhamma* corresponds in content partly to Pācittiya 95 of the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga (Vin IV 344): *yā pana bhikkhunī anokāsakataṃ bhikkhuṃ pañhaṃ puccheyya, pācittiyan ti* ("A nun who puts a question to a monk who has not given her permission [to do so, commits a] Pācittiya [offence]").

On the one hand, the *garudhammas* separate the nuns' Order from the monks' Order, as they are only valid for nuns; on the other hand they integrate the two Orders, in that they regulate the personal relationship of the nuns to the monks.⁵⁴ They are thus of fundamental importance in the evaluation of the position of the Bhikkhunīs in relation to that of the Bhikkhus. In the *garudhammas* "the dependence of the Bhikṣunīsaṅgha on the Bhikṣusaṅgha is at times quite bluntly expressed".⁵⁵ All eight *garudhammas* express an aspect of the personal subordination of individual nuns to the monks.⁵⁶ Hermann Oldenberg, in fact, sees the significance of the Bhikkhunīsaṅgha within the early Buddhist community as defined through the *garudhammas*.⁵⁷ He is perhaps not going too far when he says,⁵⁸ "As the wife is under the guardianship of the husband, the mother under the guardianship of her sons, so the Order of nuns is under the guardianship of the Order of monks." Although the Bhikkhunīsaṅgha is in itself a completely

"admonishing". Oldenberg, 1959, p. 345, gives reasons why *vacanapatha* here cannot be taken to mean that a nun is not allowed to speak to a monk at all. He maintains that what is meant is that she is not allowed to call a monk to account for an offence. As against that, the sequence of addressing one another was apparently dependent on social hierarchy and thus "speaking to" in the narrower sense may be intended here.

⁵³Vin II 255: *ajjatagge ovaṭo bhikkhunīnaṃ bhikkhūsu vacanapatho, anovaṭo bhikkhūnaṃ bhikkhūsu vacanapatho*.

⁵⁴See also BhīPr, p. 118.

⁵⁵BhīPr, p. 8. Cf. also Oldenberg, 1959, p. 345.

⁵⁶BhīPr, p. 8.

⁵⁷Cf. Oldenberg, 1959, p. 347.

⁵⁸Oldenberg, 1959, p. 343.

independent institution, as a whole it is subordinate to the Bhikkhusaṅgha. Roth even suspects that the *garudhammas* were in fact aimed at discouraging women from entering the Order.⁵⁹ This interpretation, however, does not seem appropriate to the historical situation. When the Buddha, contrary to contemporary custom, admits women into his Order, he is on new spiritual ground, which demands particular consideration for the views of “the people”.

When Mahāpajāpatī has accepted the eight *garudhammas* without hesitation, Ānanda conveys this to the Buddha. It is only then that the Buddha expresses his misgivings about the admission of women into the Buddhist Order to Ānanda, and establishes the consequent importance of keeping the eight *garudhammas*.⁶⁰ Before this, the founder of the religion had explained the consequences of his assent to the establishment of an Order of nuns thus:⁶¹

⁵⁹BhīVin(Mā-L), p. xxxi.

⁶⁰Vin II 256 (Cv X.1.6) *seyyathāpi Ānanda puriso mahat taḷākassa paṭigacc’ eva ālim bandheyya yāvad eva udakassa anatikkamanāya, evam eva kho Ānanda mayā paṭigacc’ eva bhikkhunīnaṃ aṭṭha garudhammā paññattā yāvajīvaṃ anatikkamanīyā ti* (“Ānanda, just as a man, looking ahead, builds a dam for a great [water] reservoir, so that the water does not overflow, so have I, with foresight, laid down for nuns eight *garudhammā* which are to be kept for life”).

⁶¹Vin II 256 (Cv X.1.6) *sace Ānanda nālabhissa mātuḡāmo tathāgatappavedite ... pabbajjaṃ ciraṭṭhitikaṃ Ānanda brahmacariyaṃ abhaviṣṣa, vassasahassaṃ saddhammo tiṭṭheyya. yato ca kho Ānanda mātuḡāmo tathāgatappavedite ... pabbajjito, na dāni Ānanda brahmacariyaṃ ciraṭṭhitikaṃ bhaviṣṣati, pañc’ eva dāni Ānanda vassasatāni saddhammo ṭhassati. seyyathāpi Ānanda yāni kānici kulāni bahutthikāni appapurisakāni tāni suppadhamṣiyāni honti corehi kumbhatthenakehi, evam eva kho Ānanda yasmiṃ dhammavinaye labhati mātuḡāmo ... pabbajjaṃ na taṃ brahmacariyaṃ ciraṭṭhitikaṃ hoti. seyyathāpi Ānanda sampanne sālikkhetta setaṭṭhikā nāma rogaḡāti nipatati evan taṃ sālikkhettaṃ na ciraṭṭhitikaṃ hoti, evam eva kho Ānanda yasmiṃ dhammavinaye labhati mātuḡāmo ... pabbajjaṃ na taṃ brahmacariyaṃ ciraṭṭhitikaṃ hoti. seyyathāpi Ānanda sampanne ucchukkhette mañjeṭṭhikā nāma rogaḡāti nipatati evan taṃ ucchukkhettaṃ na ciraṭṭhitikaṃ hoti, evam eva kho Ānanda yasmiṃ dhammavinaye labhati mātuḡāmo ... pabbajjaṃ na taṃ brahmacariyaṃ*

“If, Ānanda, women had not received the Pabbajjā in the *dhamma* and *vinaya* expounded by the Tathāgata, the Brahmā path would have lasted long. The *saddhamma* would have lasted 1000 years. And now, Ānanda, that women have received the Pabbajjā in the *dhamma* and *vinaya* expounded by the Tathāgata, the Brahmā path will not last long, Ānanda. The *saddhamma* will last only 500 years.”⁶²

“Just as families with many women and few men are easily overpowered by thieves, so the Brahmā path in whose *dhamma* and *vinaya* women receive the Pabbajjā will not last long.

“Just as when a disease known as mildew affects a whole rice field, that field will not last long, so the Brahmā path in whose *dhamma* and *vinaya* women receive the Pabbajjā will not last long.

“Just as when a disease known as blight affects a whole field of sugar cane, that sugar cane field will not last long, so the Brahmā path in whose *dhamma* and *vinaya* women receive the Pabbajjā will not last long.”

Women are equated with disease and their admission into the Buddhist Order allegedly brings about an earlier decline of the Buddhist teaching. The Buddha says this, not as the reason he is against the establishment of the Order of nuns,⁶³ but only after the deed has already been done.

These statements are difficult to reconcile with the fact that the Buddha had without hesitation admitted that women had the ability to attain Enlightenment and had in the end assented to the establishment of an Order of nuns. Here on the one hand the ambivalence becomes clear which reflects the currents of a time of radical spiritual change and on the other hand this passage illustrates the personal conflict in which the founder of the religion may have found himself. His affection for his

ciraṭṭhitikaṃ hoti.

⁶²The numbers given are surely not to be taken literally. Probably, in fact, long periods of time are meant (cf. Horner, 1930, p. 105, n. 3). No time is given in the *Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavācānā* (Schmidt, 1993), 4a2/3.

⁶³However, *Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavācānā* (Schmidt, 1993), 4a2/3.

foster mother led him to wish to protect her interests but also led him into conflict with his wider social milieu, as the decision to include women in the community of the Order was not usual at that time.

Beginning from the assumption that the events recorded in the *Cullavagga* did in fact take place in this or in a similar way, an attempt has been made to formulate a uniform assessment of women on the part of the Buddha.

B.C. Law takes the view that the rights which were granted to the nuns within the Saṃgha were not the result of the liberal attitude of the Buddha, but that on the contrary they had been hard won by the nuns themselves. He starts from the assumption that the Buddha himself was against the establishment of the Order of nuns,⁶⁴ but had to bow to the persistent entreaties of the women. At the same time, Law believes it probable that the Buddhist Order of nuns was only established after the Buddha's death.⁶⁵ This interpretation, however, is not supported by a critical examination of the texts.

In several more recent works on women in early Buddhism it has been unanimously established that in comparison to his contemporaries, the Buddha himself took a progressive attitude toward women.⁶⁶ As the idea of the admission of women into ascetic communities was nothing new,⁶⁷ the decision to establish an Order of nuns was not so exceptional. However, as Horner states, the Buddha gave a strong further impulse to a new development of his time.⁶⁸ In addition, Horner points

⁶⁴Cf. Law, 1927, p. 66.

⁶⁵Cf. Law, 1927, p. i.

⁶⁶Thus Horner, 1930; Kabilsingh, 1984; Pitzer-Reyl, 1984; and Jordt, 1988, pp. 31-39.

⁶⁷There were a great many Jain nuns living in Vesālī, where the events leading to the admission of women into the Buddhist Order took place, according to Horner, 1930, p. 108. This statement, however, she only substantiates through one passage, Jātaka 536 (cf. Horner, 1930, p. 108, n. 5). On parallels in the traditions regarding the establishment of Orders of Jain and Buddhist nuns cf. Horner, 1930, p. 102.

⁶⁸Cf. Horner, 1930, p. 108; thus also Pitzer-Reyl, 1984, p. 20.

The Legend of the Establishment of the Buddhist Order of Nuns 61
out that apart from this point in the *Cullavagga* there are no further proofs in the Vinaya that the Buddha was originally against the establishment of an Order of nuns.⁶⁹ Another conjecture expressed in the literature suggests that the reservations of the Buddha regarding the establishment of a nuns' Order was due to his realistic appraisal of the situation of women living the homeless life.⁷⁰ It was clear to him that women belonging to no household would be deprived of protection. Transferral of this protecting role to the monks would have meant that they would have had to take on within the Saṃgha the very role which they had just decided to give up by joining the Order to concentrate on their spiritual development. Although early Buddhism did not differentiate between men and women regarding the ability to achieve Enlightenment, in other areas Kajiyama concludes that social discrimination against women was predominant.⁷¹

As has been shown, the passage examined here contains eloquent but partially contradictory information regarding the position of women in early Buddhism. On the one hand, the acknowledgement that women, like men, are able to attain Enlightenment illustrates that the Buddha did not discriminate between the sexes in this respect. Such a specific assessment is fundamental for a definition of the position of women within a community in which the declared goal of each member is the attainment of Enlightenment (escape from the cycle of rebirth). In addition, the result of the events described in the first section of Chapter Ten of the *Cullavagga*, that is, the establishment of the nuns' Order by the Buddha, establishes that the founder of the religion was prepared to take into account the concept of equality of the sexes provided for in Buddhism, documented here by acknowledgement of the full ability of women to attain Enlightenment.

On the other hand, the *garudhammas* make it clear that a nun is

⁶⁹Cf. Horner, 1930, p. 105.

⁷⁰Cf. Kabilsingh 1984, pp. 24f. and cf. Kajiyama, 1982, pp. 53-70, see especially p. 60.

⁷¹Cf. Kajiyama, p. 70. and Jordt, 1988, p. 34.

always below a monk in social rank. In fact, these particular rules for nuns also ensure that the nuns are guaranteed male protection and knowledgeable instruction. Nevertheless, this is outweighed by the aspect of the control exercised by the monks. The nuns were usually subject to two authorities, the monks to only one, and the final judgement always rested with the monks. Although the *Bhikkhunīsaṃgha* was conceived as a completely independent institution in itself, as a whole, nevertheless, it was subordinate to the *Bhikkhusaṃgha*. The traditional ideas of the relations between the sexes were thus taken over into the life of the Buddhist Order.

It must be added here that the Buddha was probably not able to free himself entirely from the idea of woman as temptress and so did not consent unreservedly to the establishment of a nuns' Order.⁷² According to Pitzer-Reyl, an assessment of the position of women in early Buddhism is impossible without taking account of the rule of celibacy, which is fundamental to the Buddhist community (*Pārājika 1* of the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*). As Buddhism is a religion with basically ascetic characteristics, it partly took over from Brahmanism the traditional view that identified woman with a sexuality hostile to Enlightenment (being a distraction from the religious goal).⁷³ The Buddha evidently saw himself and the Order he founded in the context of his wider social milieu and in particular within the context of the other religious communities which originated at that time. The Buddhist Order was founded in a time of radical spiritual change and Buddhism was but one of many newly established ascetic religious communities. Thus, while it was possible for the Buddha to take the risk of disseminating his new ideas, he must also have been aware that the new would only last if it first gained the acceptance of his contemporaries.

An added complication was that the Buddhist Order had been conceived as dependent on the good will of a lay community and was thus in competition with the other religious communities established at

⁷²Cf. Also Kabilsingh, 1984, pp. 25f., and Pitzer-Reyl, 1984, p. 20.

⁷³Cf. Pitzer-Reyl, 1984, pp. 16f.

the time. Against this background, the hesitation of the Buddha over the establishment of an Order of nuns is also understandable. On the one hand, he wanted to take into account the concept of equality provided for in Buddhism, and in addition to that there was probably the particular obligation he felt towards his (foster) mother, yet on the other hand, the demands of the wider social milieu could not be ignored. Many passages in the *Vinaya* indicate that the Buddha was an innovator as well as being a conservative person.

According to tradition, a number of the rules of the *Suttavibhaṅga* were only drawn up because "the people" complained about the behaviour of the monks or nuns.⁷⁴ These complaints are, however, often described as based on misunderstandings and misinterpretations on the part of the laity. Nevertheless the Buddha always reacted by laying down a rule, thus complying with the wishes of "the people". This conformism of the Buddha, documented in the *Vinaya*, confirms the conjecture that it was his thinking with regard to the understanding of the lay members which was the cause of his hesitation as well as for the subordination of the nuns to the monks. It is possible that he was afraid that if he accorded equal status to women within his Order, it would cost him many members and thus endanger the very survival of the Buddhist Order. Bearing in mind that Buddhism was only one among many contemporary ascetic groups this is more than probable. Nevertheless, while interpreting the histories of the *Pāṭimokkha* rules, it must be borne in mind that they are probably more recent than the corresponding rules themselves. Often the whole history only represents a "schematic setting for the content of the formula".⁷⁵ This leads to the conjecture that the histories of the individual rules of the *Pāṭimokkha* contained in the *Suttavibhaṅga* arose for the most part from the need of

⁷⁴Thus *Pārājika 2* and *Samghādisesa 7* of the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*, *Samghādisesa 1*, *Nissaggiya-Pācittiya 1, 11, and 12* of the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga*. Cf. also Hecker, 1977, p. 95.

⁷⁵*BhīPr*, p. 185.

the monks and nuns to have a historical basis for each rule.⁷⁶

The passage examined here contains clear indications that the legend of the establishment of the Order of nuns did not originate entirely from events which actually took place. In view of the chronological succession of the events described, the text seems much more likely to have been extended gradually, reflecting the concerns of various “editors”. According to Horner, it was the men who handed down the texts. It was therefore quite possible that they neglected to transmit some of the passages which referred to women. Only events which were so unusual that they could not be omitted were handed down. She explains,⁷⁷ “It should be remembered too, that monks edited the sayings attributed to Gotama and they would naturally try to minimise the importance which he gave to women.” Possibly the legend recounted in this section of the *Cullavagga* may be seen as a reflection of such a development. Thus it is also uncertain whether the Buddha himself demanded so complete a subordination of nuns to monks as is laid down in the eight *garudhammas*.

There was a time lapse between the death of the Buddha⁷⁸ and the final codification of the Vinaya. As the Buddha left his community without a spiritual leader, many problems arose for the then leaderless Saṃgha. Often the rules for behaviour laid down by the Buddha were inadequate to meet new cases of conflict. Therefore new rules had to be drawn up. These rules were also attributed to the Buddha, the sole “lawmaker” in his lifetime,⁷⁹ in order to prevent any doubt as to their binding character. It is probable that during this period, elements of a patriarchal system gained greater acceptance, altering the concept of equality originally provided for in Buddhism.

⁷⁶Cf. BhīPr, p. 185. Dieter Schlingloff, 1964, p. 538, takes this view: “In one story or another memories of actual incidents in the community may have been reflected. However, most of the stories are pure invention in order to give reasons for the regulations.”

⁷⁷Horner, 1930, p. 105.

⁷⁸Cf. Bechert, 1991.

⁷⁹Hecker, 1977, p. 90.

It is possible that the compilation of the *garudhammas* to hand constitutes a later insertion into the Vinaya, which is more recent than the rules corresponding to the *garudhammas* in the Pācittiya section of the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga. Pointers toward this are the inconsistency in the sequence of *garudhammas* (see *garudhamma* 5 in particular); the unsystematic order of the eight *garudhammas* in the *Cullavagga*; the difference in the sequence of *garudhammas* in the traditions of other Buddhist schools,⁸⁰ as well as the parallels both literal and in content in the Pācittiya section of the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga. It is therefore possible that the compilation of the eight *garudhammas* is not based on an original conception but is the product of a process of development. It may be assumed that some of the *garudhammas* examined here stem from the time when the Buddhist Order of nuns was already a fixed component of the Buddhist community. Possibly after the death of the Buddha there was a tendency within the nuns’ community to abolish the additional rules for nuns, or at the least, to mitigate them, whereupon conservative members of the Order may have felt compelled to give them added weight by establishing them as the *garudhammas*.

ABBREVIATIONS

BD	I.B. Horner (transl.), <i>The Book of the Discipline, Vinaya Piṭaka</i> Vols. 1–6, London 1938–66.
BhīPr	Ernst Waldschmidt, <i>Bruchstücke des Bhikṣuṇī-Prātimokṣa der Sarvāstivādins</i> , Leipzig 1926 (Kleinere Sanskrit-Texte, 3).
BhīVin(Mā-L)	Gustav Roth, ed. <i>Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya including Bhikṣuṇī-Prakīrṇaka of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin</i> , Patna 1970 (Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series, 12).
Cv	<i>Cullavagga</i> .
Mv	<i>Mahāvagga</i>

⁸⁰A further indication is also the direct link of the *garudhammas* with the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga* in the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin. Roth explains (BhīVin(Mā-L), p. xxx), “This throws a clear light upon the tendency which has been observed in regard to the arrangement and the composition of our Bhi-Vin(Mā-L), the tendency being to supply a complete set of the Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya as a whole which is consistent in itself.”

- Sp Buddhaghosa, *Samantapāsādikā, Vinaya-aṭṭhakathā*. J. Takakusu and M. Nagai, eds., 7 vols., London: PTS 1924–47. [Index vol. by H. Kopp, London: PTS, 1977].
- Vin *Vinayaṭṭhaka*, ed. H. Oldenberg, 5 vols., London 1879–83.

WORKS CITED

- Barua, R.B. 1966. "Comparative Study Of The Bhikkhu And Bhikkhuni Vibhanga", *Muhammad Shahidullah Felicitation Volume*. Ed. M. E. Haq. Asiatic Society of Pakistan Publication No.17. Dacca.
- Bechert, Heinz, ed. 1991. *The Dating of the Historical Buddha/ Die Datierung des historischen Buddha*. 3 Parts. Göttingen: Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Kl., III.189.
- Hecker, Hellmuth. 1977. "Allgemeine Rechtsgrundsätze in der buddhistischen Ordensverfassung (Vinaya)", H. Krüger: *Verfassung und Recht in Übersee*, X.1.
- Heng-Ching Shih, Bhikṣuṇī. 1991. "Frauen im the Mahāyāna", *Töchter des Buddha*, ed. Karma Lekshe Tsomo (Munich).
- Hinüber, Oskar von. 1968. *Studien zur Kasussyntax des Pāli, besonders des Vinaya-Piṭaka*. Munich: Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft, Beiheft 2.
- Horner, Isaline Blew. 1930. *Women under Primitive Buddhism: Laywomen and Almswomen*. London: Broadway Oriental Library.
- Jordt, Ingrid. 1988. "Bhikkhuni, Tilashin, Mae-Chii: Women Who Renounce the World in Burma, Thailand and the Classical Pali Buddhist Texts". *Crossroads* 4, no. 1 (Fall).
- Kabilsingh, Chatsumarn. 1984. *A Comparative Study of Bhikkhunī Pāṭimokkha*. Chaikhamba Oriental Research Studies 28. Varanasi.
- Kajiyama, Yuichi. 1982. "Women in Buddhism". *The Eastern Buddhist*, NS, Vol. XV No. 2 (Autumn).
- Laut, Jens Peter. 1991. "Die Gründung des buddhistischen Nonnenordens in der alttürkischen Überlieferung", *Türkische Sprachen und Literaturen: Materialien der ersten deutschen Turkologen-Konferenz, Bamberg, 3–6 Juli 1987*; Wiesbaden: *Societas Uralo-Altaica*, Vol. 29; eds. I. Baldauf, K. Kreiser, and S. Tezcan.
- Law B.C. 1927. *Women in Buddhist Literature*. Colombo.
- The Legend of the Establishment of the Buddhist Order of Nuns* 67
Nyanatiloka. 1983. *Buddhistisches Wörterbuch*, 3rd ed. Konstanz.
- Oldenberg, H. 1959. *Buddha, sein Leben, seine Lehre, seine Gemeinde*. Stuttgart.
- Pitzer-Reyl, Renate. 1984. *Die Frau im frühen Buddhismus*. Marburger Studien zur Afrika- und Asienkunde. Serie B, Asien: Bd. 7. Berlin.
- Rhys Davids, T.W., and H. Oldenberg, trans. 1881–85. *Vinaya Texts*. 3 vols. Oxford: Sacred Books of the East, vols. 13, 17, 20.
- Schmidt, Michael, ed. 1993. "Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavacanā: Die Handschrift Sansk. c.25(R) der Bodleian Library Oxford", *Studien zur Indologie und Buddhismuskunde, Festgabe des Seminars für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde für Professor Dr. Heinz Bechert*. Eds. Reinhold Grünendahl, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, and Petra Kieffer-Pülz. *Indica et Tibetica*, no. 22 (Bonn), pp. 239–88.
- Schlingloff, Dieter. 1964. "Zur Interpretation des Prātimokṣasūtra". *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 113, pp. 536–51.
- Vajirarañāṇavararasa. 1983. *The Entrance to the Vinaya (Vinayamukha)*. 3 vols. Bangkok.

ADDITIONAL PUBLICATIONS

- Bartholomeusz, Tessa J. *Women Under the Bō Tree*. Cambridge, 1994.
- Chung, Jin-II. "Gurudhamma und gurudharmāḥ", *Indo-Iranian Journal* 42 (1999), pp. 227–34.
- . *Pravāraṇāvastu im Vinayavastu der Mūlasarvāstivādin*. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 7. Göttingen, 1997.
- Freiberger, Oliver. "Zur Interpretation der Brahmaḍaṇḍa-Strafe im buddhistischen Ordensrecht", *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 146 (1996), pp. 456–91.
- Goor, Maria Elisabeth Lulius van. *De buddhistische Non. Geschetst naar gegevens der Pāli-Literatuur*. Diss. Leiden, 1915.
- Heirman, Ann. "Gurudharma: An Important Vinaya Rule", *Indian Journal of Buddhist Studies* 10, nos. 1, 2 (1998), pp. 18–26.
- Hinüber, Oskar von. "Buddhist Law According to the Theravāda-Vinaya: A Survey of Theory and Practice", *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 18.1 (1995), pp. 7–45.

- . “Buddhist Law According to the Theravāda-Vinaya II: Some Additions and Corrections”. *Journal of the Internatioanl Association of Buddhist Studies*, 20/2 (1997), pp. 87–92.
- . *Das Pātimokkhasutta der Theravādin: Seine Gestalt und seine Entstehungsgeschichte. Studien zur Literatur des Theravāda Buddhismus II*. Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und Literatur, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, 1999, no. 6.
- Hüsken, Ute. “A Stock of Bowls Requires a Stock of Robes: Relations of the rules for Nuns in the Theravāda Vinaya and the Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin”, *Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur II, Gustav Roth zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Eds. Heinz Bechert, Sven Bretfeld, and Petra Kieffer-Pülz. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 9 (Göttingen), 1997, pp. 165–200.
- . “Rephrased Rules: The Application of Monks’ Prescriptions to the Nuns’ Discipline in Early Buddhist Law”, *Buddhist Studies (Bukkyō Kenkyū)* XXVIII (March 1999), pp. 29–29.
- . *Die Vorschriften für die buddhistische Nonnengemeinde im Vinaya-Piṭaka der Theravādin*. Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie, no. 11. Berlin, 1997.
- Kieffer-Pülz, Petra. *Die Sīmā: Vorschriften zur Regelung der buddhistischen Gemeindegrenze in älteren buddhistischen Texten*. Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie, no. 8. Berlin, 1992.
- Nolot, Édith. *Règles de Discipline des Nonnes Bouddhistes*. Collège de France, Publications de l’Institut de Civilisation Indienne, no. 60. Paris, 1991.
- . “Saṃghāvaśeṣa-, saṃghātiśeṣa-, saṃghadiseṣa-”, *Bulletin d’Études Indiennes* 5 (1987), pp. 251–72.
- . “Studies in Vinaya Technical Terms, I–III”, *Journal of the Pali Text Society* XXII (1996), pp. 73–150.
- . “Studies in Vinaya Technical Terms, IV–X” *JPTS* XXV (1999), pp. 1–111.
- W. Pachow. *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa on the Basis of its Chinese, Tibetan, Sanskrit and Pali Versions*. Santiniketan, 1955.
- Paul, Diana Y. *Ordained Women in Buddhism: Survey and Present State of Research*. Unpublished. Magisterarbeit, Hamburg, 1993.
- Schmidt, Michael. “Zur Schulzugehörigkeit einer nepalesischen Handschrift der Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavacanā”, *Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur I*, Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden,

- Beiheft 5 (Göttingen, 1994), pp. 155–64.
- Skilling, Peter. “A Note on the History of the *Bhikkhūni-saṅgha* (II): The Order of Nuns After the Parinirvāna,” *W.F.B. Review* 30/4 (1993), 31/1 (1994), pp. 29–49.
- Sponberg, Alan. “Attitudes Towards Women and the Feminine in Early Buddhism”, *Buddhism, Sexuality, and Gender*. Ed. José Ignacio Cabezón, Bibliotheca Indo-Buddica Series, 113 (Albany, 1992), pp. 3–36.
- Wijayaratna, Mōhan. *Les moniales bouddhistes: Naissance et développement du monachisme féminin*. Paris, 1991.