A Preliminary Study of the Dunhuang Tibetan Fragments of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-Ekottarakarmaśataka (I): Tarjanīyakarman
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Abstract: This paper identifies a lost Old Tibetan version of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-Ekottarakarmaśataka (hereafter, EK) as preserved in Dunhuang Tibetan fragments. It firstly gives a brief introduction to the related Tibetan manuscripts Pelliot tibétain 945 and Indian Office Library Tibetan J 596, and then analyses the textual nature of the Old Tibetan version of the EK preserved in these manuscripts by comparing with its cognate Chinese version, i.e., Genbenshuoyiqieyoubu baiyijing (T 1453) translated by Yi Jing (635–713 CE). Then, it focuses on the passage of the tarjanīyakarman (Tib. bsdigs pa’i las, Chin. 令怖羯磨), one of the ecclesiastical rituals for punishment in the Buddhist Order, as seen in the Old Tibetan version of the EK. It reveals that the tarjanīyakarman passage therein is textually related to, even derived mutatis mutandis from, Pāṇḍulohitakavastu. In sum, this paper introduces for the first time the ‘true’ Tibetan version of the EK long forgotten yet preserved in Dunhuang, and attempts to show its affiliation with the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition.
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1. Dunhuang Tibetan Fragments of the EK: PT 945 and ITJ 596

In the Stein Collection of the British Library there is a fragmental Tibetan manuscript ITJ 596 (Indian Office Library Tibetan J 596), which was correctly recognised by Louis de La Vallée Poussin as ‘Las brgya’ rtsa gcig po / [Ekottara-karma-śataka]’ (La Vallée Poussin 1962: 183). Another Tibetan fragment PT 945 (Pelliot tibétain 945) from the Pelliot Collection of the Bibliothèque nationale de France was incorrectly identified as ‘[f]ragments du Karmaśataka’ by Marcelle Lalou 1950: 22. In this paper, these two fragments,
ITJ 596 as well as the folios 1 and 3 of the PT 945, are identified as belonging to one manuscript, and the text inscribed is, as referred to in the colophons of these two manuscripts, kar ma sha ta ka, or las brgya’rtsa gcig po, or las brgya rtsa gcig pa (ITJ 596: 10r5, 21r1; PT 945: 3v1).1

PT 945: As described by Lalou, PT 945 consists of four folios in Pothi format, three of which are complete, measuring 52 cm × 8.5 cm in length and width, respectively, while one folio is fragmental. As mentioned, folios 1 and 3 belong to the same manuscript as ITJ 596, yet folios 2 and 4 are from another manuscript of mDzangs blun zhes bya ba’i mdo (D 341 / Q 1008). Lalou identified one story on folio 2 (T ibetan page number ‘ga 12’) to be about Upagupta and a servant, which is now identified as the 47th story U pa kub ta of the Tibetan mDzangs blun (TERJÉK 1970: 71–78), equivalent to the 60th story Youbojuti of the Chinese Xianyu jing (T 202 [IV] 442c10–443a9).2 The fragmental folio 4 (Tibetan page number nonexistent), which Lalou did not recognise, is the 51st story Dge slong kyang te of the Tibetan mDzangs blun (D 341 mdo sde, a 297b6–298b7), equivalent to the 62nd story Shami Junti of the Chinese Xianyu jing (T 202 [IV] 444c9–445a5).3 Interestingly, no other Dunhuang Tibetan manuscript of mDzangs blun contains this story, as far as I know.

Regarding folios 1 (‘KA 81’) and 3 (‘[KA 6]3’),4 they are inscribed in 7 lines in dbu can Tibetan script per folio side, and are decorated with big circles in red ink around two threading holes as well as the red vertical lines on both margins. In folio 1, on lines 4 and 6 of the recto side, there are two patterns made of three small circles in red and black ink arranged in the form of an inverted triangle, set off by shad, possibly marking the end of a topic passage.5 On the verso side of folio 3, following the main text is an illustration made of

---

1 Regarding folio number, I take the number of the manuscripts as represented on the online databases of the International Dunhuang Project (http://idp.bl.uk/database/oo_scroll_h.a4d?uid=188672498;recnum=5448;index=1 [accessed 17 July 2020]) and the Bibliothèque nationale de France (https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8302971m.r=pelliot%20tibetain%20945?rk=21459;2 [accessed 16 March 2020]).

2 Another Dunhuang Tibetan manuscript containing the same story U pa kub ta of the Tibetan mDzangs blun is PT 943. For a general introduction to the Dunhuang Tibetan manuscripts of the mDzangs blun, see TERJÉK 1969: 289–316. For a critical edition of the U pa kub ta story in PT 943, see TERJÉK 1970: 71–78.

3 Shayne Clarke also recognised these two stories from the mDzangs blun or Xianyu jing. Rf. personal email (31 May 2020).

4 Thanks to Shayne Clarke for his help in the Tibetan page numbers. Rf. personal email (31 May 2020).

5 Brandon Dotson and Agnieszka Helman-Ważny explain that such pattern can ‘mark off key passages or instructions in a text’. They also refer to the similar patterns made of double, triple and quadruple circles. Cf. DOTSON and HELMAN-WAŻNY 2016: 84.
two flaming Bodhi-trees (Table 1). Following is a colophon kar ma sha ta ka bam po drug go, marking the end of the 6th bam po.

**ITJ 596:** As noted by de La Vallée Poussin, ITJ 596 consists of 29 folios in *Pothī* format, the folio measuring 52.2 cm × 8.6 cm in length and width, respectively. The Tibetan page numbers of ITJ 596 are not consecutive (numbered as ‘KA 19–22, 24–26, 28, 30–34, 47–51, 58, 62, 64–72’). Before folio ‘KA 30’ there are 6 lines inscribed in *dbu can* script per folio side, and after folio ‘KA 31’, 7 lines. Similar to PT 945, red circles around two threading holes and red marginal lines could be seen therein. The patterns marking the end of a topic passage could also be found in ITJ 596: 2r1, 2r5, 3r3, 3v2, 3v6, 4r5, 10r4, 12r1, 19v3, 20r6, 20v3, 21v2, 22r1, 25v3, 26r2, except here the circles are arranged in the form of either a vertical line or a quadrangle. The Bodhi-tree (as well as other unclear pattern) illustrations, which mark the end of a text section, also appear in ITJ 596: 15r7, 15v3 (?), 16v3 (?), 17r1, 17v6, 18r6, 19r7, 20v6 (?), 24r4, 24v5, 28v1 (Table 1). Colophons in ITJ 596 are to be found on 10r5 (‘KA 31’) as kar ma sha ta ka / bam po dang ’og go […] las brgya’ rtsa gcig po bam po gsum mo, perhaps marking the end of the 2nd bam po and the beginning of the 3rd bam po; and also in the 21r1 (‘KA 64’), las brgya [rtsa?] gcig pa’l bam po bdun no, possibly marking the beginning of the 7th bam po.

PT 945 (folios 1 and 3) and ITJ 596 belong to one manuscript, yet they were split up and respectively collected into the Pelliot and Stein collections. As described before, PT 945 and ITJ 596 have almost the same format characteristics regarding folio length and width, lines inscribed per side, paleography, two threading holes, red marginal lines, the illustrations and patterns (Bodhi-tree and small circles), etc. Also, folio 3 (‘[KA 6]3’) of PT 945 continues in content folio 20 (‘KA 62’) of ITJ 596, thus the text from ITJ 596: 20v6 to the end of PT 945: 3 corresponds to a coherent passage about the *smṛtivinaya* (Tib. dran pa ’dul ba, Chin. 憶念毘奈耶) in *Genbenshuoyiqieyoubu baiyijemo* 根本說一切有部百一羯磨 (hereafter, *baiyijemo*) (T 1453 [XXIV] 494a20–b2). Moreover, both manuscripts have

---

6 Dotson and Helman-Ważny 2016: 84.
7 Shayne Clarke kindly informs me of the similar drawings in PT 903. Rf. personal email (31 May 2020).
8 According to the paleographic system of Sam van Schaik, PT 945 and ITJ 596 seem to be inscribed in ‘the sutra style’ of Tibetan writing from the Tibetan imperial period around the first half of 9th century. Cf. van Schaik 2014: 309–312; Dotson and Helman-Ważny 2016: 91–116.
9 Much gratitude to Shayne Clarke for confirming the connection between ITJ 596: 20 and PT 945: 3. Rf. personal email (31 May 2020).
Table 1. Bodhi-tree and other Illustrations of the ITJ 596 and PT 945

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITJ 596</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10r4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15r7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT 945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3v1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© British Library; © Bibliothèque nationale de France
the same reference to its title in its abbreviated form *kar ma sha ta ka,* and the full title may be reconstructed as *Ekottarakarmaśataka* based on the Tibetan translation of its title seen in the ITJ 596. Therefore, PT 945 (folios 1 and 3) and ITJ 596 come from the same manuscript, and preserve a text called *Las brgya rtsa gcig pa* or *Ekottarakarmaśataka.

2. A Preliminary Textual Analysis of the Old Tibetan Version of the EK

The Dunhuang Tibetan text of *Las brgya rtsa gcig pa* as seen in PT 945 and ITJ 596 is an Old Tibetan translation of the EK affiliated with the Mūlasarvāstivāda school, and we argue that this text is the ‘true’ Tibetan version of the EK long forgotten yet preserved in Dunhuang. It is textually cognate with Yi Jing’s Chinese translation baiyijiemo, both belonging to the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition. However, significant differences in text between the Old Tibetan and Chinese versions of the EK implies that they were translated from different Vorlagen of the same text.

The *Las brgya rtsa gcig pa* text in PT 945 and ITJ 596 shows orthographic features of Old Tibetan, such as *da drag*, *gi log*, *ma ya btags*, *rjes su nga ro*, *'a* suffix, and medial *'a.* As recorded in the catalogues *lHan kar ma* (No. 492) and *'Phang thang ma* (No. 455), *Las brgya rtsa gcig pa* consisted of 12 *bams* in 3600 *ślokas* in sum. Therefore, the *Las brgya rtsa gcig pa* text in PT 945 and ITJ 596 might be an Old Tibetan translation of the EK dating back to the Tibetan Imperial period. Yi Jing translated a Chinese version of the EK, i.e. *baiyijiemo,* in 10 fascicles during 700–703 CE. After comparing the Old

---

10 Possibly because this *kar ma sha ta ka* is the abbreviated form of the full title, *LALOU 1950:* 22 mistook PT 945 as another Buddhist narrative text, *Karmaśataka* (Tib. *Las brgya tham pa,* D 304 / Q 1007) that has a similar title.

11 This is not suggesting that the vulgate Tibetan Tanjur version of *Las brgya rtsa gcig pa* (D 4118 / Q 5620) is a ‘fake’ text, but since the Old Tibetan version and Yi Jing’s translation of the EK are textually cognate and affiliated with Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition, questions about the text nature and the school affiliation of D 4118 require further research. But in light of the *tarjanīyakarman* passage, it is clear that D 4118 (*'dul ba, wu* 223b3–224b5) is different from the Old Tibetan and Chinese versions of the EK, and it is more like an abbreviated version of the EK consisted of merely the *karmavācanā* formulae recited during the *karman* rituals, which corresponds to §§ 1.4–1.5, 1.11–1.13 of the *tarjanīyakarman* text in the diplomatic edition below. A full comparison between both versions of the EK and D 4118 would require another research, but this paper does not focus on that. For an insightful comparison between Yi Jing’s translation and D 4118, see KISHINO 2013: 17–18.

12 For a fuller description of the Old Tibetan orthography, see DOTSON and HELMAN-WAŻNY 2016: 72–81.


Tibetan and Chinese versions of the EK, one would soon realise that they were parallel texts but with deviations in certain passages.

Table 2. Old Tibetan and Chinese Versions of the EK Compared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Old Tibetan version (ITJ 596, PT 945)</th>
<th>Chinese version (T 1453 [XXIV])</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Folio number</td>
<td>Tibetan Page number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>ITJ 596: 1–4</td>
<td>KA 19–22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>ITJ 596: 5–7</td>
<td>KA 24–26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>ITJ 596: 8</td>
<td>KA 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>ITJ 596: 9–13</td>
<td>KA 30–34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>ITJ 596: 14–15v4</td>
<td>KA 47–48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>ITJ 596: 15v4–17r1</td>
<td>KA 48–50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>ITJ 596: 17r1–18</td>
<td>KA 50–51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>ITJ 596: 19</td>
<td>KA 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>ITJ 596: 20r1–v6</td>
<td>KA 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>ITJ 596: 20v6–PT 945: 3</td>
<td>KA 62–63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>ITJ 596: 21–22r1</td>
<td>KA 64–65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>PT 945: 1</td>
<td>KA 81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerning the text structure, the Old Tibetan version of the EK arranges the topics regarding various Buddhist karman rituals in a sequence close to baiyijiemo, but deviations between them are also found in the text. As shown in Table 2, in §§ 1–3: folios 1–8 (‘KA 19–22, 24–26, 28’) of ITJ 596 contain the text that corresponds to a long consecutive passage of T 1453 [XXIV] 461a22–464c27, and the content therein is a detailed description of the upasampadā ritual for bhikṣunī. However, since the folios ‘KA 23’ and ‘KA 27’ are missing here, we could expect that the Old Tibetan version of the EK has been inserted with more text than baiyijiemo here. In addition, it seems that the uddānas present in baiyijiemo are missing in the Old Tibetan version. For example, in ITJ 596: 8v4–5, after the topic of aṣṭau gurudharmāḥ (Tib. lei ba’i chos brgyad, Chin. 八尊敬法), the text continues with three sets of double shad marking the end of the topic, then turns to dge sbyong mar byed pa’l chos bzhi (Chin. 沙門尼四種所應作法) with no gap. But in the Chinese version,
two summary verses of the \textit{aṣṭau gurudharmāḥ} are inserted here.\footnote{The same verses could also be located in T 1458 [XXIV] 582a14–17; T 1451 [XXIV] 351b7–10; T 1457 [XXIV] 522c16–19. For a comparative study on the \textit{aṣṭau gurudharmāḥ} as seen in the Vinaya traditions of various Buddhist sects, see \textsc{Chung} 1999; \textsc{Tsedroen} and \textsc{Anālayo} 2013: esp. 744 n.3 for a more detailed bibliography of related studies.} Afterwards, § 4: folios 9–13 (‘KA 30–34’) of ITJ 596 correspond to the text of T 1453 [XXIV] 465b5–466c29 in \textit{baiyijie}. Here, after the topic of \textit{tshad myed pa’l ’khor bca’ ba’l sdom} (Chin. 畜無限門徒法), in ITJ 596: 10r4–5 there is the colophon marking the end of the 2nd \textit{bam po} and the beginning of the 3rd \textit{bam po}, as mentioned before.

However, in §§ 5–7: folios 14–18 (‘KA 47–51’) the order of topics in the Old Tibetan text shows substantial difference from the Chinese version. ITJ 596: 14–15v4 (‘KA 47–48’) contains a text parallel to T 1453 [XXIV] 477b26–478b11, elucidating individual situations concerning the topic of \textit{mtshams gyI phyi rol du song} (Chin. 出界外). Following is ITJ 596: 15v4–17r1 (‘KA 48–50’) containing the passage parallel to T 1453 [XXIV] 477b10–478a21, mainly about the adaptations of \textit{bhikṣu} precepts to the local condition in \textit{yul rdo mtha’I pha rol} (Chin. 邊方國). The position of this topic as presented in both versions of the \textsc{ek} is confusing, since in Chinese text it is inserted abruptly after the \textit{jñapticaturthakarman} of \textit{jiatuo qinghui 假託輕毀白四} and before the \textit{jñaptidvitīyakarman} of \textit{guanzao xiaofangdi 見造小房地白二} with no obvious relation with each other, while in the Old Tibetan version this topic is inserted after the topic of \textit{mtshams gyI phyi rol du song} (Chin. 出界外) and before the \textit{brtags pa’I gnas cho} (Chin. 結淨厨). Actually, this passage is not about a specific \textit{karman} at all, but it might be extracted from \textit{Carmavastu}\footnote{\textsc{Dutt} 1950: 188–190, 205, 209; T 1447 [XXIII] 1052a29–1053a14, 1056b26–c1, 1057b1–3.} and \textit{Bhaiṣajyavastu}.\footnote{\textsc{Dutt} 1947: 2–5; T 1448 [XXIV] 1a23–c11.} Following the aforementioned insertion is ITJ 596: 17r1–18 (‘KA 50–51’), of which the Chinese parallel text is T 1453 [XXIV] 494c19–496a15. Afterwards, § 8: folio 19 of ITJ 596, corresponds to T 1453 [XXIV] 483c27–484c30 in \textit{baiyijie}. More deviations of the textual arrangement between the Old Tibetan and Chinese versions of the \textsc{ek} are to be seen in §§ 9–13: folios 20–29 of ITJ 596 and folio 3 of PT 945 (‘KA 62–72’). The texts of § 9 and § 12 that are separated in the Old Tibetan version (ITJ 596: 20r1–v6, 22r1–28v1; ‘KA 62, 65–71’) are successive to each other in \textit{baiyijie} (T 1453 [XXIV] 486b3–490b5). § 10 and § 11 (ITJ 596: 20v6–22r1; PT 945: 3; ‘KA 62–65’) also contain a consecutive passage in the Chinese parallel (T 1453 [XXIV] 493c7–494b14), but in a reversed order. That is, in the Old Tibetan text, the topic of the \textit{smṛtivinaya} is set at the end of the 6th \textit{bam po}, before the topic of \textit{amūḍhavinaya} (Tib. \textit{ma myos pa’i’ dul ba}, Chin. 不癡毘奈耶) and \textit{tatsvabhāvaiṣīya} (Tib. \textit{ngo}}
bo nyid tshol ba, Chin. 求罪自性), both of which are at the beginning of the 7th bam po. But in baiyijimo, the smrtvinaya follows the amūdhavinaya and tatsvabhāvaiṣīya in the 9th fascicle. Then, in § 13, ITJ 596: 28v1–29 (‘KA 71–72’) contains a passage about sīmā (Tib. mtshams, Chin. 界), of which the Chinese parallel is T 1453 [XXIV] 467c10–468b22. Actually, it continues the topic aforementioned in ITJ 596: 13v4–v7 of § 4, but the text is separated abruptly and the topic is retaken up 37 folios later! At last, § 14 is made up of folio 1 of PT 945 (‘KA 81’), and its parallel in baiyijimo is T 1453 [XXIV] 498b7–498c28 in the 10th fascicle near the end of the whole text. So it is possible that the entire number of folios of the Dunhuang Tibetan fragments of the EK would be around 81–85.

As shown above, the Old Tibetan version of the EK as preserved in ITJ 596 and PT 945 shares with the Chinese parallel text baiyijimo a close textual structure, but their arrangements of the order of individual topics about karman is substantially different, especially in §§ 7, 10–13, and this might be caused by the different Vorlagen they were translated from. This textual variation derived from Vorlagen could be attested not only in text structure, but also in content, especially regarding the different approaches to the details of topics as represented in both versions. Here I would give three examples.

1) ITJ 596: 5v5–6r1 = T 1453 [XXIV] 463a16–b13: Regarding the trayo niśrayāḥ (Tib. gnas gsum rIg pa, Chin. 三依法) for bhikṣunī, while baiyijimo gives us the details during the upasampadā ritual how to regulate the pāṃśukūla (Tib. phyag dar khrod pa, Chin. 糞掃衣), piṇḍapātika (Tib. bsod snyoms, Chin. 常乞食), and pūtimuktabhaiṣajya (Tib. sman, Chin. 陳棄藥), the Old Tibetan text of the EK just mentions the three in passing. Probably here the Old Tibetan version omits the ritual details since they have been elucidated before when relating the catvāro niśrayāḥ (Chin. 四依法) for bhikṣu.

It seems that the structure as given in the Old Tibetan text has been rearranged deliberately, and this rearrangement was introduced either to the Old Tibetan translation itself or even to its Indic Vorlage. For example, cf. § 1.6 of the tarjanīyakarman text in the diplomatic edition below. While the stock sentences therein about the ‘not-to-do’ list of a punished monk are reduced and the text reminds readers to see the fuller sentences in the previous passage, we could only locate the complete cliche in the tatsvabhāvaiṣīya passage, which is placed right before the tarjanīyakarman passage in the Old Tibetan fragments, but in baiyijimo, the tatsvabhāvaiṣīya passage is two fascicles later. Given that Yi Jing’s translation is earlier than the Old Tibetan one, and that he did not rearrange his Vorlage nor his translation, and that the textual inconsistency was originally present in the Indic Vorlage, it is possible that the Tibetan translators obtained a similar Indic Vorlage as Yi Jing’s and soon realised its textual inconsistency and tried to make sense of it by rearranging the structure of the text, e.g. putting the tatsvabhāvaiṣīya passage right before the tarjanīyakarman passage. But more possible is that the Vorlage of the Old Tibetan translation was more consistent and coherent than Yi Jing’s. Cf. § 1.6, n.56.

The page number of the end of the Chinese version is T 1453 [XXIV] 500b13.
2) ITJ 596: 6v6–7r1 = T 1453 [XXIV] 463c6–464a20: Similar to the former case, when explaining the adattādāna (Tib. ma byin bar len pa, Chin. 不與取), pranātipāta (Tib. myi bsad pa, Chin. 害命), and mṛṣāvāda (Tib. myl bla ma ‘i chos smra ba, Chin. 妄語), of the aṣṭau pārājikāh (Tib. ltung ba ’Ichos brgyad, Chin. 八墮落法) for bhikṣunī, the Old Tibetan version again mentions them in passing and meanwhile recalls that the details should be filled in as before (de bzhIn rgyas bar *rIg par* byos shIg), but baiyijiemo again gives full details. Probably, the Old Tibetan text omits the details that have been fully demonstrated in the catvārah pārājikāh (Chin. 四墮落法) for bhikṣu.

3) ITJ 596: 8r1–v3 = T 1453 [XXIV] 464c7–c13: More interesting is the topic of aṣṭau gurudharmāḥ for bhikṣunī here. While the Chinese version mentions the 8 aspects of the aṣṭau gurudharmāḥ in a condensed way, and the fuller elucidation could be located in the Genbenshuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye zashi 根本說一切有部毘奈耶雜事 (*Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya-Kṣudrakavastu, T 1451 [XXIV] 351a1–25), which was also translated by Yi Jing, the Old Tibetan version lists only the last 5 aspects, since the text of the first 3 is written on the former folio, which is missing, although it gives details that are almost the same as zashi. Moreover, the sequence of the 5 aspects in the Old Tibetan text is slightly different from zashi and baiyijiemo. In the Old Tibetan text, it is: 4) pravāraṇā; 5) codanā; 6) ākroṣa; 7) abhivādana; 8) mānāpya, but last 5 aspects of the Chinese tradition are: 4) codanā; 5) ākroṣa; 6) abhivādana; 7) mānāpya; 8) pravāraṇā. This shows that in the Old Tibetan version, the pravāraṇā is placed ahead of the other 4 aspects, and this is actually the same in Bhikṣunīkarmavācanā (Schmidt 1993: 244–248, 269–270) and the Tibetan translation of Kṣudrakavastu, i.e., ’Dul ba phran tshegs kyi gzhi (D 6 ’dul ba, tha 102a7–104a6, 118b5–119b4). But in Bhikṣunīkarmavācanā and ’Dul ba phran tshegs kyi gzhi the last 2 aspects are 7) mānāpya; 8) abhivādana. Therefore, it is possible that the Old Tibetan version of the aṣṭau gurudharmāḥ stands in a transitional phase between the Sanskrit Bhikṣunīkarmavācanā and the Tibetan ’Dul ba phran tshegs kyi gzhi on one hand, and the Chinese zashi and baiyijiemo on the other, although all belong to the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition.

---

20 For a comparative study on the order of the 8 aspects of the aṣṭau gurudharmāḥ shown in the Vinaya traditions of different Buddhist schools, see Chung 1999: 229; TseDroen and Anālayo 2013: esp. 744 n.3 for a more detailed bibliography of related studies.

21 Based on Chung’s classification, the Old Tibetan version of the aṣṭau gurudharmāḥ might be defined as the ‘Mū. III’ type, different from the ‘Mū. I’ (Bhikṣunīkarmavācanā and ’Dul ba phran tshegs kyi gzhi) and ‘Mū. II’ (T 1451; T 1453; T 1458). Cf. Chung 1999: 227–229. On the school affiliation of Bhikṣunīkarmavācanā with the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition, see Schmidt 1994; Chung 1998a.
Therefore, based on their different presentation of details regarding individual topics, as well as their different textual structures mentioned earlier, we could possibly conclude that the Old Tibetan text Las brgya rtsa gcig pa in PT 945 and ITJ 596 was derived from a Vorlage of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Ekottarakarmaśataka, which differed from the Vorlage of Yi Jing’s Chinese translation baiyijiemo. Probably these two Vorlagen belong to two subgroups of the Mūlasarvāstivāda school.

As already noticed by KISHINO 2013: 17–18, the Chinese baiyijiemo contains many passages from the Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya, ‘such as narratives, question-and-answers between Upāli and the Buddha, and the rules regulated by the Buddha’. So does the Old Tibetan version. In the next section I give a preliminary diplomatic edition and translation of the text concerning the tarjanīyarman, to provide a concrete example demonstrating the textual relationship between the Old Tibetan and Chinese versions, and also to prove their school affiliation to the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition.

3. Tarjanīyarman in the Old Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivāda–Ekottarakarmaśataka

Three kinds of karman, the formal ecclesiastical acts of the Buddhist Order, are discussed in the Ek: jñaptikarman (Tib. gsol ba, Chin. 單白), jñaptidvitīyakarman (Tib. gsol ba dang gnyIs pa, Chin. 白二), and jñapticaturthakarman (Tib. gsol ba dang bzhi’I pa, Chin. 白四). However, as revealed by CLARKE 2015, the number of karmans belonging to each category varies in different Vinaya texts affiliated with different sects, and it seems that only the Chinese Ek clearly refers to 22 jñaptikarman, 47 jñaptidvitīyakarman, and 32 jñapticaturthakarman (T 1453 [XXIV] 498c29–499c5), while other traditions usually mention 24, 47 and 30 respectively, such as Sapoduobu pini modeleqie 薩婆多部毘尼摩得勒伽 (T 1441 [xxiii] 569a24–28, 610c7–611a29) and the vulgate Tibetan Tanjur version of Las brgya rtsa gcig pa (D 4118 ‘dul ba, wu 256a3–4). Since the remaining Dunhuang Tibetan

22 On some examples of the close parallels between the baiyijiemo and Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya, see KISHINO 2013: 17 n.50.

23 For a detailed study of the three categories of karman, see HU-VON HINÜBER 1994: 206–209; NOLOT 1996: 82–86; CHUNG 1998b: 19–32. Clarke explains these three as: jñaptikarman, ‘acts consisting of a motion (jñāpti) only’; jñaptidvitīyakarman, ‘acts in which the motion is followed by a single proclamation and passed as the second (dvitīya) part of the procedure’; and jñapticaturthakarman, ‘acts in which the motion is followed by three proclamations and passed as the fourth (caturtha) part of the procedure’. Cf. CLARKE 2012: 18–21; 2015.

24 Cf. CLARKE 2012: 20–21. In the Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō edition of the Dashamen baiyijiemofa 大沙門百一羯磨法 (T 1438 [XXIII] 489a5–6), it contains as most traditions 24 jñaptikarman, 47 jñaptidvitīyakarman, and 30 jñapticaturthakarman, but the editors report that one recension
fragments of the EK do not contain the number of individual categories, we do not know whether the Old Tibetan version deviates from its Chinese parallel again as in the case of the \textit{a\ṣtau gurudharmāḥ} or not.

\textit{Tarjanīyakarman}, ‘the formal act of censure’,\textsuperscript{25} is categorised as the \textit{jiñapticaturthakarman} in the EK. It is one of the so-called ‘Bestrafungs-Karmas’ for punishing dissident monks in the Buddhist Order.\textsuperscript{26} The text of \textit{tarjanīyakarman} in the Old Tibetan version of the EK (ITJ 596: 22r1–24r4), as well as its Chinese parallel (T 1453 [XXIV] 486c13–487c10), is textually cognate with, or even directly derived from, \textit{Pāṇḍulohitakavastu} §§ 1.1–1.13 (\textsc{Yamagiwa} 2001: 34–47, 143–150. Hereafter, PL).

In this section, I offer a diplomatic edition of the \textit{tarjanīyakarman} text in the Old Tibetan text of \textit{Las brya rtsa gcig pa} with philological commentary, and translate the text. Given that no Sanskrit parallel of the EK is available, we use the PL (in Sanskrit and Tibetan), as well as the \textit{baiyijiem}, to help understanding the Old Tibetan text.\textsuperscript{27} Here I rely on Yamagiwa’s critical edition (2001) of the PL, and on the \textit{Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō} for the Chinese EK to edit the fragments. And I also use Yamagiwa’s division of the \textit{tarjanīyakarman} text in the PL to arrange the Old Tibetan text. However, since this preliminary edition focuses on the text itself, further study on the \textit{tarjanīyakarman} across various Vinaya traditions affiliated with different Buddhist schools will not be offered here (\textbf{Table 3}).

\textsuperscript{25} Kishino 2013: 63. It could also be translated as ‘act of rebuke or threat’ (BHSD s.v. \textit{tarjanīya}); ‘Zurechtweisung/Degradierung/Erniedrigung’ (\textsc{Chung} 1998b: 23); ‘blame’ (\textsc{Nolot} 1999: 3); ‘Rechtshandlung, die zur Degradierung führt’ (\textsc{Yamagiwa} 2001: 13).
\textsuperscript{26} On the Bestrafungs-Karmas, see \textsc{Yamagiwa} 2001: 13 n.20 for a fuller bibliography of related studies.
\textsuperscript{27} It is reported that Jin-il Chung has located some Sanskrit fragments about the \textit{parivāsikakarman} of the EK in the Pelliot Collection (Numeros Verts 20–22, 33; with the title reconstructed as ‘\textit{Ekaśatakarman}’), but no further studies have been published yet as far as I know. Cf. \textsc{Hartmann} and \textsc{Wille} 1997: 168–9; 2014: 215. Sanskrit fragments SHT 1048 (‘Beginn des \textit{Pāṇḍulohitavastu} der Sarvāstivādins’), SHT 1057 (‘Fünfergruppen von Verhaltensmaßregeln bei Gemeindeverhandlungen’) and SHT 1108 (‘Fünfereihen gemischten Inhalts’) seem to contain passages related to \textit{tarjanīyakarman}, so they should also be consulted in any edition. Cf. \textsc{Sander} and \textsc{Waldschmidt} 1985: 34–36, 46–48, 102–104.
### Table 3. Tarjanīyakarman in the EK Compared with Other Vinaya Traditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya</th>
<th>Mūlasarvāstivāda-EK</th>
<th>Pāli-vinaya</th>
<th>Sarvāstivāda-vinaya</th>
<th>Dharmaguptaka-vinaya</th>
<th>Mahīśāsaka-vinaya</th>
<th>Mahāsāṃghika-vinaya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘tarjanīyaṃ karma’</td>
<td>‘bsdlgs pa’l las’</td>
<td>‘tajjanīyakamma’</td>
<td>‘般茶盧伽法’</td>
<td>‘呵責揵度’</td>
<td>‘呵責羯磨’</td>
<td>‘諍訟相言’ of ‘折伏羯磨’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 1.1 | 22r1–3 | 486c13–19 | 1.5–2.20 | 221a20–b16 | 889a14–b9 | 163a2–9 | 424a12–16, 438c2–6 |
| 1.2a | 22r3–4 | 486c19–22 | 3.1–32 | 221b19–c8 | 889c29–890a10, 890a17–20 | 163a14–19 | 438c6–439a5 |
| 1.2b | 22r4–6 | 486c22–26 | 3.33–4.16 | 890a10–17, 20–23 | -- | -- | -- |
| 1.3 | 22r6 | 486c26–27 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 1.4 | 22r6–v1 | 486c27–487a2 | 2.20–29 | 221c8–20 | 889b9–20 | -- | 424b3–5 |
| 1.5 | 22v1–3 | 487a2–9 | 2.29–38 | 221c20–29 | 889b20–c3 | 424b5–11 |
| 1.6 | 22v3–4 | 487a9–11 | 5.5–17 | 889c3–28 | 163a19–26 | -- | -- |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.7</th>
<th>487a11–18</th>
<th>5.17–25, 6.26–34</th>
<th>5.17–6.7</th>
<th>1.12</th>
<th>7.4–16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.8a</td>
<td>22v6–7</td>
<td>22v6–23r1</td>
<td>22v6–7</td>
<td>23r1</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8b</td>
<td>23r1–2</td>
<td>23r1–2</td>
<td>23r1–2</td>
<td>23r1</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8c</td>
<td>23r2–3</td>
<td>23r2–3</td>
<td>23r2–3</td>
<td>23r2</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8d</td>
<td>23r3–4</td>
<td>23r3–4</td>
<td>23r3–4</td>
<td>23r3</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9a</td>
<td>23r5–6</td>
<td>23r5–6</td>
<td>23r5–6</td>
<td>23r5</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9b</td>
<td>23r6–7</td>
<td>23r6–7</td>
<td>23r6–7</td>
<td>23r6</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9c</td>
<td>23r7</td>
<td>23r7</td>
<td>23r7</td>
<td>23r7</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9d</td>
<td>23r8–10</td>
<td>23r8–10</td>
<td>23r8–10</td>
<td>23r8</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>23r1–4</td>
<td>23r1–4</td>
<td>23r1–4</td>
<td>23r1</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>23r4–7</td>
<td>23r4–7</td>
<td>23r4–7</td>
<td>23r4</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>23r7–24r4</td>
<td>23r7–24r4</td>
<td>23r7–24r4</td>
<td>23r7</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table entries indicate the page numbers and sections of the Dunhuang Tibetan Fragments of the Cūḷavagga and Kammakkhandhaka, along with corresponding entries in other Vinaya traditions. The page numbers correspond to the Dunhuang Tibetan Fragments (ITJ 596) and the Old Tibetan and Chinese translations, including the Old Tibetan translation (800a23-b1), the Old Tibetan translation (890a23-b1), and the Chinese translations (T1435, T1428, T1421). The page numbers are referenced for specific sections and are divided into sub-sections (e.g., 1.1, 1.2a, 1.2b, etc.).
§ 1.1

[ITJ 596.22r (KA.65)] gjzhl mnyan du yod pa29 na ste / [22r2] de’l tshe yang dge srong pha leb rga’ pa30 zhes bya ba thab mo byed log po byed rdeg pa byed tshI lg ngan du smra rtsod par byed31 de de’32 dge srong pha’l dge ’dun nams la ’ang

28 PL (Skt.): buddho bhagavāṃ Śrāvastiṃ viharati jetavane Anāthapiṇḍadasyārāme | tena khalu samayena Śrāvastiṃ Pāṇḍulohitikā (Yamagiwa suggests to read Pāṇḍulohitakā) bhiksāvah prativasaṃt kalaharakā khanṭanahararakā vigrahakārakā ēdhikaranikā | te saṃghā ’bhiksāṃ adhikaranāṇy utpādayanti yena saṃghāḥ kalahajāto viharati khanṭanahajāto vigṛhīto viśvādī ēppanah | etat prakaranāṃ bhikṣavo bhagavata ārocayanti • bhagavān ēha | kuruta yūyaṃ bhiksāvah Pāṇḍulohitakānāṃ bhiksūnāṃ kalaharakārānāṃ khanṭanaharakārānāṃ viṣṭhitānāṃ viśvādī ēppanānāṃ ēdhikaranikānāṃ tarjanīyaṃ karma iti | yo vā punar anyo ’py evamātīṭyāḥ.

29 PL gives a more detailed location where Buddha resided, i.e. Śrāvastiṃ... jetavane Anāthaṇidaddasasyārāme (rgyal bu rgyal byed kyi tshal mgon med zas sbyin gyi kun dga’ rpañ ed na bzhugs so || de’i tshe mnyan yod na dge srong dmar ser can | ’thab krol byed pa | mtshang ’dru bar byed pa | rtsod par byed pa | ’gyed par byed pa | rtsod pa’i gzhi byed pa mams gnas te | de’i tshe sro dge’ dun la yang dlang yang du rtsod pa’i gzhi skyed pas des na dge ’dun ’thab krol dlang | mtshang ’dru ba dlang | rtsod pa dlang | ’gyed pa byung zhih gnas so || skabs de dge srong mams kyi bcom ldan ’dun la gsal pa dlang | bcom ldan ’dun la gsal pa’i kyi bka’ stsal pa | dge srong dag khyed kyi dmar ser can gyi dge srong ’thab krol byed pa | mtshang ’dru bar byed pa | rtsod par byed pa | ’gyed par byed pa | rtsod pa’i gzhi byed pa mams dlang | gzhan yong de lta bu dlang mthun pa su yang rung ba la bsdsigs pa’i las byos shig.

30 As noted by YaMaGiwa 2001: 14–15, PL affiliated with Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition seems to treat Pāṇḍulohitakā [bhiksāvah] ([dge srong] dMar ser can, rendered as ‘[the monks of] the group of Pāṇḍulohita’. BHSD s.v. pāṇḍulohita), not as a dvandva compound, but the adjective derived from the proper name of one person, while other Vinaya traditions clearly state these to be two persons. The Old Tibetan translation dge srong pha Leb rga’ pa seems to take the Leb rga’ pa (*lohita?, NEgi s.v. le rga’gan) as the name of a group of monks, which is the same with PL. But the Chinese parallel ‘半豆盧呬得迦等’ (譯為黃赤色) might not necessarily be the case. Yi Jing seems to most of the time take ‘半豆盧呬得迦’ as one person (e.g. in T 1442 [XXIII] 705a10–12), but in Genbensapoduopu lüshe 根本薩婆多部律攝 (*Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinayasamgraha, T 1458 [XXIV] 548a11–20) which was composed by *Viśeṣamitra 胜友 and translated by Yi Jing during the same time as the Chinese Ek, ‘半豆’ and ‘呬得迦’ are referred as two persons clearly. For *Viśeṣamitra, see CLARKE 2012: 19; KISHINO 2013: 16 n.43. The Old Tibetan translation of the proper name Leb rga’ pa seems to be closer to *lohita than the dMar ser can (*piṅgala?, NEgi s.v. dmar ser) which is seen in the PL (Tib.) or Las brgya rtsa gcig pa (D 4118). The rare form leb rga’ (le rga’gan more used later) is also attested in PT 1120.r11, cf. TAKEUCHI 1986: 589–590.

31 The Old Tibetan text thab mo byed log po byed rdeg pa byed tshI lg ngan du smra rtsod par
rtag du '{ga} thab du 'dzud / rdeg du 'dzud tshlg ngan gyls smrar 'dzud / dge 'dun rams rtsod par byed de33 / de lta bu'I phyir34 beom ldan 'das kyls bka' stsal pa' // [22r3] dge slong pha khyed kyls dge slong pha leb rgan pa de thab mor byed log por byed 'deg35 par byed rtsod par Θ byed pa' / de dag la bsdlgs pa'I las byos shlgs / 'on tang gzhan {du} yang tshul de bzhIn rig par Θ 'gyur36 te /

[令怖白四:] 佛在室羅伐城時，半豆盧啗得迦等(譯為黃赤色)諸苾芻輩是鬪諍者、是評論者，彼便數數舉眾諍事，常令僧伽不安樂住，能令諍競展轉增長。諸苾芻以緣白佛，佛言： "汝諸苾芻！應與半豆盧啗得迦等作令怖羯磨。若更有餘如是流類，應如是與。"

Trans.: The scene was in the city Śrāvastī (mnyan du yod pa). Once there was [a group of] monks of Leb rgan pa as named, who were quarrelsome, hostile, assaultive, ready to insult, and disputative, so they made the Order always to be quarrelsome, assaultive, ready to insult, and to dispute with...
monks. Therefore, Buddha commanded, ‘Monks! [You] must perform the formal act of censure (bsdIgs pa’I las) to those monks of Leb rgan pa who were quarrelsome, hostile, assaultive and disputative! Also, in any other [similar] situation, [perform] accordingly!’

§ 1.2a

rnam pa lnga dang ldan na bsdigs pa’I las byas pa ’ang chos bzhIn gyl{s} las kyang ma yIn ’dul ba’I las kyang ma yIn te d{e} ge ’dun nams ’ang de’I phyir ’das pa dang bcas Θ par ’gyur ba’o / Inga gang zhe na ma bskyod pa dang dran bar ma byas pa rnam dang dngos po myed pa dang / Θ khas myl lend pa dang thad na myed pa la bya*s pa* o40 //

“有五緣作令怖羯磨，是非法羯磨、是非毘奈耶羯磨。僧伽作時，得越法罪。何謂為五？一、不作詰問；二、不為憶念；三、無其實；四、不自臣罪；五、不對面作。”

37 PL (Skt.): paṃcabhiḥ kāraṇais tarjanīyaṃ karma kṛtam adharmakarma ca tav avinayakarma ca saṃghaś ca tena sātisārah | katamāiḥ paṃcabhiḥ | acodayitvā kuruṃvanty asmārayitvā avastukam apratijñayā asaṃmukhiḥbhūtasya kuruṃvanti. PL (Tib.): rgyu lngas bsdigs pa’i las byas na | de ni chos ma yin pa’i las dang ’dul ba ma yin pa’i las yin pa’i las yin te | des ni dge ’dun yang ’gal tshabs can du ’gyur ro || Inga gang gis zhe na | gleng ma ba byas pa dang | dran par ma byas pa dang | gzhi med pa dang | khas ma blangs pa dang | mngon sum du ma gyur par byed pa’o.

The Old Tibetan text here rnam pa lnga dang ldan, and the Chinese parallel ‘有五緣’ suggest their Vorlage to be *paṃcabhiḥ kāraṇais samanvāgataṃ instead of paṃcabhiḥ kāraṇais (rgyu lngas) seen in PL here. However, in SHT 1108 v.4–r.1 there is paṃcabhir dharmāiḥ samanvāgataṃ tarjanīyaṃ karma kṛtam adharmakarma ca bhavati (avinayakarma ca, and similar text is also attested in PL (Skt.) §§ 1.8–1.9, so the reconstruction for the Old Tibetan text here is possible. Cf. SANDER and WALDSCHMIDT 1985: 103–104; HÄRTEL 1956: 146.

38 The Old Tibetan text ‘das pa dang bcas pa’ (Chinese text ‘得越法罪’) seems to be a literal translation of sātisāra (’gal tshabs can du ’gyur), and ‘das (‘越’) could be taken as a variant form of ‘da’, cf. WTS s.v. ‘da’, s.v. ’das.

39 For five lawful and unlawful acts, cf. Karmavastu (DUTT 1942: 206–209; D 1 ’dul ba, ga 138a3–140a2). Among the five aspects in the Old Tibetan text, while the dran bar ma byas pa (Chinese parallel as ‘不為憶念’) and khas myl lend pa (‘不自臣罪’) are the same as PL (Tib.), dran par ma byas pa (kurvyanty asmārayitvā, ’don’t make to remember’) and khas ma blangs pa (apratijñayā, ’don’t verbally acknowledge’), except for that blangs is the perfect form of len, yet other three aspects are translated differently. Ma bskyod pa, ‘don’t prompt’ (WTS s.v. skyod), seems to be a loose translation of acodayitvā kuruṃvanty (gleng ba ma byas pa), but the Chinese text ‘詰問’ (’ask’) understands the √ cud the same as PL (Tib.). Also, dngos po myed pa (*abhāva, ’no substance’, WTS s.v. dngos po) could also be reconstructed as avastukam (gzhi med pa) as in PL, but it seems closer to the Chinese parallel ‘無其實’ The last one thad na myed pa la bya*s pa*, ‘perform not in direct presence’ (’不對面作’) also corresponds to asaṃmukhiḥbhūtasya kuruṃvanti (mngon sum du ma gyur par byed pa). These five aspects are also attested in SHT 1108 v.5–r.1: avastukam kṛtam bhavati | asaṃmukhiḥbhūtasya kṛta[m] bhavati acodayitvā kṛtam bhavati asmārayitvā kṛtam bhavati apratijñayā kṛtam bhavati. Cf. SANDER and WALDSCHMIDT 1985: 104.
Trans.: The formal act of censure which is done with the five aspects is deemed as not a lawful act, nor a disciplined act, through which the monks commit the sin of transgression. Which five? 1) Not prompt; 2) not make to remember; 3) no substance; 4) not acknowledge; and 5) perform not in presence.

§ 1.2b

rnam pa lnga dang ldan na bsIgs pa’i las [22r5] byas pa yang chos bzhIn gyi las dang ’dul ba’I las su ’gyur te / {de} *dge* ’dun rnam la Θ ’ang ’das pa dang bcas pa myed do // Inga gang zhe na bskyod pa dang dran bar byas pa rnam dang dngos Θ po yod pa dang khas lend pa dang thad na yod pa las byas pa’o // de ’ang ’dl bzhin du byos [22r6] shIg /

“復有五緣作令怖羯磨,是如法羯磨、是如毘奈耶羯磨，僧伽無過：先作詰問；令其憶念；其事是實；自復臣罪；對面作法。如是應作。”

Trans.: The formal act of censure which is done with the five aspects is deemed as a lawful act, a disciplined act, for which the monks don’t commit the sin of transgression. Which five? 1) Prompt; 2) make to remember; 3) with substance; 4) acknowledge; and 5) perform in presence. Perform likewise!

§ 1.3

stan bting ba nas dge slong pha gcIg gis gsol *ba* byos la las gyIs shIg ces pa’I bar du ste //

“為前方便，准上應知。次令一苾芻為白四羯磨。”

---

41 PL (Skt.): paṃcabhis tu kāraṇaṣya karma kṛtaṃ dharmakarma ca tad vinayakarma ca saṃghaś ca tena na sātisāraḥ | katamāḥ paṃcabhiḥ | codayitvā kurvanti smārayitvā savastukāṃ pratijñayā saṃmukhibhūtasya kurvanti.
PL (Tib.): yang rgyu lngas bsdigs pa’i las byas na | de ni chos kyi las dang ’dul ba’I las yin te | des na dge ’dun yang ’gal tshabs can du mi ’gyur ro || Inga gang gis zhe na | gleng ba byas pa dang | dran par byas pa dang | gzhi dang bcas pa dang | khas blangs pa dang | mngon sum du gyur par byed pa’o.42

42 PL (Skt.): evaṃ ca punah kartavyaṃ | šayanāsanaprajñāptiṃ kṛtvā gaṇḍīṃ ākoṭya pṛṣṭavācikayā bhikṣun samanuyuyja sarvasamghe saṃnīṣaṇe sannipatite ekena bhikṣunā jñaptiṃ kṛtvā karma kartavyam*.
PL (Tib.): ’di ltar yang bya ste | gnas mal bshams la gaṇḍī brdungs te | dris pa’i tshig gis dge slong mams la yang dag par bsgo la | dge ’dun thams cad tshogs shing mthun par gyur pa dang | dge slong gcig gis gsol ba byas te las bya’o.

43 The Old Tibetan and Chinese texts both reduce the stock sentences of the karman preparational procedure. Or they simply translated the first sentence of the PL, i.e. evaṃ ca punah kartavyaṃ (’di ltar yang bya ste). In the Old Tibetan fragments of the EK, no complete stock sentences are attested except for some less reduced ones, e.g. in ITJ 596: 9v2, 10r7, 11r7, 12r3 and 13v3 as stan thing ste ’ga’ ’de rdungs la, which corresponds to the PL (šayanāsanaprajñāptiṃ kṛtvā...
Trans.: Seating couch is prepared [, and so on]. Then one monk brought the motion (gsol *ba*) and performed the act, saying...

§ 1.4

gson cig btsun ba'I dge 'dun rnams dge slong leb rgan pa 'dl thab mo byed log po byed 'deg pa byed tshIg ngan du smra / rtsod par byed de des 'di ltar dge slong pha'I *dge* 'dun rnams la 'ang / rtag du 'thab du 'dzud 'deg du 'dzud tshIg ngan gyls smra bar 'dzud dge 'dun rnams rtsod par byed de / de dge 'dun gyI dus la bab cing bzod na dge 'dun gyls gnong46 shIg / dge 'dun gyls dge slong leb rgan pa thab mo byed log po byed 'deg pa byed tshIg ngan
ganḍīm ākoṭya, gnas mal bshams la ganḍi brdungs te), but since 13v3 the rest of this cliche is written as stan bting ba nas. In the Chinese EK, the fuller stock sentence is ‘敷座席、鳴犍稚，言白復周，眾既集已’ (T 1453 [XXIV] 467a14–15) which corresponds to the PL. But lesser reduced one could also be seen in the Chinese EK, e.g. ‘敷座席、鳴犍稚，作前方便’ (T 1453 [XXIV] 465b25), which is similar with § 1.3 here. For a detailed study of ganḍī in Buddhist monastic life, especially its function during karman rituals, see Hu-von Hinüber 1991: esp. 746–749.

44 The editors of the Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō report that in the recensions from kunai-shō Zusho-ryō and Three Dynasties, it is ‘次令一苾芻為白羯磨’. This reading may be preferred and repunctuated as ‘次令一苾芻為白、羯磨’. Possibly, here ‘白[ ]羯磨’ was once misunderstood as ‘單白羯磨’, for which the reading ‘白四羯磨’ adopted in Taishō edition might be a later emendation trying to remove this confusion by referring to the following entire jñapticaturthakarman description that consists of one motion and three acts, instead of, as in PL and the Old Tibetan version here, just referring to the motion and first act. But similar phrasing is also attested in other places of the EK, e.g. in ITJ 596: 19r2 (= T 1453 [XXIV] 484a13–14): dge slong pha gcig *gls* *gsol ba gyls la las byos shIg (‘令一苾芻應先作白，方為羯磨’); ITJ 596: 26v4–5 (= T 1453 [XXIV] 489c16): de nas dge slong pha gcig gls gsol ba gyls la las byos shIg (‘次一苾芻為白[ ]羯磨’).

45 Pl (Sk.t): śṛṇotu bhādhantāḥ saṁghaḥ | ime Pāṇḍulohitikā (Yamagiwa suggests to read Pāṇḍulohitakā) bhikṣavāḥ kalahakārāḥ bhāṇḍanakārāḥ vīvādakārāḥ ādhikarānasūnāḥ | ta ete abhīkṣṇam saṁgho abhīkṣanti uṭpādayanti yena saṁgho kalahajāto viharati bhāṇḍanajāto vīvātām āpannāḥ | sacet samghaṣyā prāptakālāṃ kṣametānujñānāṃ saṁgho yat saṁghaḥ Pāṇḍulohitakānāṃ bhikṣūṇāṃ kalahākārakānāṃ bhāṇḍanakārakānāṃ vīvādakārakānāṃ ādhikaraṇikānāṃ tarjanīyaṃ karma kuryād ity eṣā jñaptiḥ.

Pl (Tib.): dge 'dun btsun pa rams gsun du gsol | dge slong dmar ser can 'di dag ni 'thab krol bgyid pa | mtshang 'dru bar bgyid pa | rtsod par bgyid pa | 'gyed par bgyid pa | rtsod pa'i gzi bgyid pa dag lags te | 'di dag gis 'dun la yang dang yang du rtsod pa'i gzi skyed par bgyid de | des na dge 'dun 'thab krol dang | mtshang 'dru ba dang | rtsod pa dang | 'gyed pa byung zing gnas na | gal te dge 'dun gyi dus la bab cing bzod na | dge 'dun gyi gnang bar mzdod cig dang | dge 'dun gyis dge slong dmar ser can 'thab krol bgyid pa | mtshang 'dru bar bgyid pa | rtsod par bgyid pa | 'gyed par bgyid pa | rtsod pa'i gzi bgyid pa rams la bsdigs pa'i phrin las mdzad do || 'di ni gsol ba'o.

46 The Old Tibetan text gnong here should be taken as the imperative form of gnang, of which usage is attested in other Dunhuang Tibetan fragments. Cf. §§ 1.5, 1.13. Cf. De Jong 1989: 41, 72, 132; ZEISLER 2004: 349.
smra rtsod pa byed pa’l phyir bsdlgs pa’l las [22v1] bgyI bar ro // de nI gsol ba’o //

“...大德僧伽聽！此苾芻半豆盧哂得迦等鬪亂僧伽令起諍競，彼便數數舉發諍事，常令僧伽不安樂住。若僧伽時至聽者，僧伽應許，僧伽今與半豆盧哂得迦等作令怖羯磨。”自如是。”

Trans.: ‘Listen, the Venerable Order! This [group of monks] of Leb r gan pa are quarrelsome, hostile, assaultive, ready to insult, and disputative, so they make the Buddhist monks always to be quarrelsome, assaultive, ready to insult, and to dispute with monks. [If the Order] consent that [it is] the right time for the Order, the Order should grant that the Order performs the formal act of censure to those monks of Leb r gan pa who were quarrelsome, hostile, assaultive, ready to insult, and disputative!’ Thus is the motion.

§ 1.5

47 gson cig btsun ba’I dge ’dun nrams / dge slong leb r gan pa ’di thab mo byed log po byed ’deg pa byed tshIg ngan du smra rtsod par byed de des ’di ltar *de* dge slong pha’I dge ’dun nrams la ’ang rtag du ’thab du ’dzud ’deg

48 Both the Old Tibetan and Chinese texts do not contain the text *tataḥ karma kartavyaṃ (de nas las bya ste)* seen in PL.
Trans.: ‘Listen, the Venerable Order! This [group of monks] of Leb rgan pa are quarrelsome, hostile, assultive, ready to insult, and disputative, so they make the Buddhist monks always to be quarrelsome, assultive, ready to insult, and to dispute with monks. Therefore, the formal act of censure has been carried out to them. The Order that consents to perform the formal act of censure to those monks of Leb rgan pa, who were quarrelsome, hostile, assultive, ready to insult, and disputative, speak no word!’ Thus is the speech of the first act. The second and third were performed likewise. ‘The Order has performed the formal act of censure to those monks of Leb rgan pa who were quarrelsome, hostile, assultive, ready to insult, and disputative. The Order consents and grants [that, so the monks] speak no word.’ Thus I take.

49 The Old Tibetan text repeats again the list of sins of the monks of Leb rgan pa, but PL (replaced with पुर्ववद यावत in Skt.) and the Chinese parallel text omit the cliche.

50 Here gag is the variant form of gang as seen in Dunhango Tibetan fragments. Cf. WTS s.v. gag.

51 The Old Tibetan text contains no sentence that corresponds to na ksamate bhāṣātāt (gang dag mi bzod pa de dag ni gsung shig) in PL, nor the ‘若不許者説’ in Chinese text.

52 The Old Tibetan text repeats again the list of sins of the monks of Leb rgan pa, but PL (replaced with पुर्ववद यावत in Skt.) and the Chinese parallel text omit the cliche.

53 It seems that Yi Jing renders the text differently from the Old Tibetan parallel and PL (Tib.), because he seems to take yasmāt tūṣṇīm together and connect this with the following evam etad dhārayāmi, while others translated the words in an order as presented in the PL (Skt.). It seems that Yi Jing tended to adopt this rendering in his translations of the Mālasarvāstivādavinaya texts. The punctuation here is based on Yi Jing’s understanding.
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§ 1.6

bsdigs pa’i las byas pa’i dge slong phas rab du dbyung ba ma byed cig / rab du myI dbyung [22v4] zhI.ng myI bya ba55 la stogs pa thams cad nI snga ma bzhIn no56

“若苾芻僧伽與作令怖羯磨已，不得與他出家，不得授他近圓，廣如上說。”

Trans.: Monks that have been performed with the formal act of censure should not make [others] go forth from home, nor make [others] not go forth from home, and so on as all [other rules] mentioned before.

54 PL (Skt.): tarjanīyakarmakṛtasyāhaṃ bhikṣor āsamudācārikāṃ dharmāṃ prajñapayāmi • tarjanīyakarkṛtena bhikṣunī na pravrājyātavāṃ | nopasampādayitavāṃ • na niśrayo deyo | na sramanoddeśa upasthāpayitavyo | na bhikṣunī avavaditavyā (Yamagiwa suggests to read avavādayitavyā) | na bhikṣunīyavavādakah (Yamagiwa suggests to read bhikṣunīyavavādakah) sammattavyo | nāpi pūrvasaṃmatena bhikṣunī avavaditavyā (Yamagiwa suggests to read avavādayitavyā) | na bhikṣuṣ ca ddayitavyaḥ smārayitavyāḥ śilavipatīyaḥ drśṭivipatīyaḥ ācāraviśaḥ ājīvaviśaḥ sthāpayitavyo | na poṣadho na pravāraṇaḥ na ājñaptikarma na ājñapticaturthān karma | tarjanīyakarmako bhikṣur yathā prajñaptān āsamudācārikān dharmān na samādāya varttate sātisāro bhavati.

PL (Tib.): dge slong dag ngas bsdigs pa’i las byas pa’i dge slong gi kun tu spyod pa’i chos bca’ bar bya ste | bsdigs pa’i las byas pa’i dge slong gis rab tu dbyung bar mi bya ste | snyen par rdzogs par mi bya | gnas mi sbyin | dge tshul gzhag par mi bya | dge slong ma rnam la gdams par mi bya | dge slong ma rnam kyi gدامs ngag dpog par bskyod par mi bya | snga’ ba bskyod na yang dge slong ma rnam la gdams par mi bya o | dge slong la tshul khrims nyams pa dang | lta ba nyams pa dang | spyod pa nyams pa dang | ’tsho ba nyams pas gling ba dang | dran par mi bya | gدامs ngag sbyin par mi bya ste | gso spyod ma yin | dgag bskyod ma yin | gsal ba dang gnyis pa ma yin | gsal bo dang bzhI’i las ma yin no | bsdigs pa’i las byas pa’i dge slong gis kun tu spyod pa’i chos ji ltar bskyod pa bskyod yang dag par blangs te ’jug par mi byed na ’gal tshabs can du ’gyur ro.

55 It seems that only the Old Tibetan text here gives the rab du myI dbyung zhI.ng myI bya ba instead of nopasampādayitavām (snyen par rdzogs par mi bya) in PL or ‘不得授他近圓’ in the Chinese parallel, which might be a scribal error, or an inferior reduction of the stock sentences. Cf. ITJ 596: 21v5–22r1, 24v2–3.

56 Both Old Tibetan and Chinese texts reduce the stock sentences and remind readers of the former fuller passages with snga ma bzhIn (‘廣如上說’). Similar reductions are attested in ITJ 596: 24v2–3 (sma dbab pa’i las byas pa des rab du dbyung ba ma *byed* cig na nas / dge ’dan gyl nang du so sor thard pa ma ’don cIg pa ’l bar du ste). However, right before the tarjanīyakarman passage of the Old Tibetan text, ITJ 596: 21v6–22r1 (= T 1453 [XXIV] 494a12–19) is exactly the complete stock sentences omitted here in § 1.6: dge slong pa des rab du ma dbyung shIg / bsnyend par rdzogs par ma byed cig / gnas ma bca’ shIg / dge sbyong pha ma ’chang shIg / dge slong pha la ma bskyod cig dran bar ma byed cig / de nI dge slong pha tshu las nyams sam spyod pa las nyams san ’tsho ba las nyams kyang ngo / lung stso ld pa la ma ’gog shIg / gso sbyIn byed pa dang gling ba dang gsal ba gnyIs kyl ba dang gsal ba dang bzhI’i las la ma ’gog shIg / dge slong ma rnam la stond par ma bskyod shIg / sngon stond par bskyod na ’a*ng* des dge slong ma rnam {sa} ma bstan cig / $ // des las ma bya shIg. Cf. n.18.
§ 1.7

dge slong pha rnams kyls dge slong  Θ leb rgan *pa* thab mo byed nas rtsod pa’I bar du ba’i phyIr thab mo’I las byas so // de bzhIn ln du bsIØgs pa’I las byas pa dang dge ’dun la ri mo shIn ln du gus pa’ dang spu bzhIn ln du ’bab pa’
dang ’byung bar yang rtsom61 ste / mtshams kyi mthar62 ’dug nas ’byung

57 PL (Skt.): ta evaṃ tarjanīyakarmakṛtā utkacaprakacās saṃgha roma pātayanti nissaraṇaṃ prajānanti (Yamagiwa suggests to read pravartayanti) sāmīcīm upadārśayānty antaḥśīme (Yamagiwa suggests to read antaḥsīmāyāṃ) shītvā osāraṇāṃ yācante kalahārakatvāc ca pratīvirāmām ētā kathayanti | etat prakaranaṃ bhikṣavo bhagavata ērocayanti • bhagavān āha | osārayata yūyāṃ bhikṣavah Pāṇḍulohitikāṃ (Yamagiwa suggests to read Pāṇḍulohitakāṃ) bhikṣūn kalahārakāṃs tarjanīyakarkṛtānīti (Yamagiwa suggests to read tarjanīyakarkṛtān  ēti) • yo vā punar anyo ’py evamjātyāḥ.

58 The Old Tibetan text ri mo shIn ln du gus pa (‘show great respect’, with ri mo taken as the variant of rim?) seems close to the Chinese parallel ‘時諸苾芻為半豆盧呬得迦等作令怖羯麾’, but their Vorlage is probably different from PL utkacaprakacās (skra gyen du bsgreng ba lta bu dang | skra zhig pa lta bu dang dge ’dun la spu sa la ltung ba lta bu byed | ’byung bar bskyod | mtshungs par nye bar ston la mtshams kyi nang du ’dug nas bslang ba gsol te | ’thab krol byed pa nyid spong ngo zhis pa’i skabs de bcom idan ’das la dge slong mams kyi gos spu dang | bcom idan ’das kyi bka’ stal pa | dge slong dag khyed kyi dge slong dmar ser can ’thab krol byed pa | bsIgs pa’i las byas pa rnams dang | gzhan yang de lta bu dang mthun pa su yang rung ba la bslang bar gys gis shig.

59 One Reviewer of this paper suggests that that mo’I las byas so here is a scribal error for bsIgs pa’I las byas so. Here I follow this suggestion and translate accordingly. While in PL (ta evaṃ tarjanīyakarkṛtā, de ltar bsIgs pa’i las byas pa de rnams), the subject of the sentence is mentioned briefly as te (de rnams), in Chinese text (‘時諸苾芻為半豆盧呬得迦等作令怖羯麾’) it is relatively more detailed, and in Old Tibetan text it is almost ready to repeat the stock description (dge slong pha rnams kyls dge slong leb rgan *pa* thab mo byed nas rtsod pa’I bar du ba’i phyIr [bsIgs pa’I las byas so).

60 While the Old Tibetan text spu bzhIn ln du ’bab pa is close to PL roma pātayanti (spu sa la ltung ba lta bu byed), the Chinese parallel omits the fallen hair metaphor, or gives an interpretive translation ‘於僧伽處不生輕慢’ which means ‘not neglect, being subdued’. For the fallen hair metaphor, see KIEFFER-PULZ 2008: 111.

61 The Old Tibetan text ’byung bar yang rtsom (‘properly initiate to be exempted’, with yang taken as the abbreviation of yang dag = sāmīcīm?) seems to omit the sāmīcīm upadārśayānty (or just upadārśayānty) of PL text nissaraṇaṃ prajānati sāmīcīm upadārśayānty (’byung bar bskyod | mtshungs par nye bar ston), while the Chinese text keeps, i.e. ‘恒申敬禮’, but in § 1.9a (also, cf. § 1.8a) the Old Tibetan text keeps the sentence (phyag ’tshal bar stond pa). And rtsom (as well as bskyod in PL (Tib.), and ‘希求’ in Chinese to some degree) here possibly implies its Vorlage to have been *pravartayanti, which may be attested in PL (Skt.) § 1.8a, and in Bhikṣuṇikaṃvācaṃ 28b5–29a1: nihsaraṇaṃ pravarttayantam sāmīcīm upadārśayantam (SCHMIDT 1993: 267). Yamagiwa prefers this reading here instead of prajānati (BHS s.v. prajānāti. YAMAGIWA 2001: 38, 146) in his translation, yet still keeps prajānati in his text edition.

62 The Old Tibetan text mtshams kyi mthar is probably translated from *antasīme instead of antaḥśīme (mtshams kyi nang du, ‘界內’) seen in PL and Chinese text.
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§ 1.8a

dge slong pha bsdigs pa’i las byas pa dechos lnga dang ldan dang ma phyung ba las ni ma dbyung shIg / lnga gang zhe na dge ’dun la ri mo gus par

63 While PL (Skt.) is osāraṇāṃ yācante (the Chinese EK goes as ‘請乞收攝法’ similarly), PL (Tib.) seems to omit osāraṇāṃ and simply reads bslang ba gsol, the Old Tibetan text again uses ’byung to translate osāraṇā as it also translates nissaraṇa (niḥsaraṇa) seen before with ’byung. Cf. BHSD s.v. osāraṇa; NOLOT 1999: 39–57.

64 It seems that the Old Tibetan text does not translate bhikṣavo bhagavata ārocayanti (bcom ldan ’das la dge slong rnams kyis gsol pa dang) as seen in PL, while the Chinese parallel does. The Old Tibetan text de lta bu ’I tshul (in Chinese text as ‘以緣’) seems to translate the etat prakaranam (skabs) in PL, but in § 1.1 it translates as de lta bu ’I phyir. Cf. § 1.1, n.34.

65 Here both Old Tibetan and Chinese EK omit the cliche of the sin list of the monks of Leb rgan pa, while PL keeps.

66 PL (Skt.): paṃcābhir dharmaḥ saamanvāgatas tarjanīyakarmakarto nodārayitvāyaḥ (Yamagiwa suggests to read nosārayitvāyaḥ) | katamaḥ paṃcābhīḥ | notkacaprakacca (Yamagiwa suggests to read notkacaprakaccaḥ) samgha roma pātayati • na nissaraṇaḥ pravarttayati na saṃcīm (Yamagiwa suggests to read sāmīcīm) upadārayati nānāḥsaṃmāyām sthitvā osāraṇāṃ yācate • tasmāc ca kalahakāraktvāc ca na pratīvirāmāmāti vadaty | ebhiḥ paṃcābhīr dharmās saamanvāgataḥ pūrvvavat*.

PL (Tib.): bsdigs pa’i las byas pa chos lnga dang ldan pa ni bslang bar mi bya’o || lnga gang zhe na | skra gyen du ’greng bta bu dang | skra zhig pa lta bu dang | dge ’dun la spu sa la ltung ba lta bur mi byed pa dang | ’byung bar mi bskyod pa dang | mtshungs par nye bar mi ston pa dang | mtshams kyi nang du ’dug ste bslang ba mi gsol ba dang | ’thab krol byed pa de mi spong ba ste | chos ’di lnga dang ldan pa ni zhes bya ba gong ma bzhin du’o.
myI byed pa dang spu bzhIn *du* myI 'bab pa dang / 'byung bar myI rtsom ba dang [22v7] phyag 'tshal bar myI stond pa dang mtshams kI mthar 'dug cing 'byung bar myI gsol ba'o // de bas na thab mo byed pa las slar myI gtong zhIng chos de lnga dang ldan na bsdigs pa'I las byas pa las ma phyung da*ng* ma dbyung shIg68 /

“[......] 有其五法與作令怖羯磨，苾芻若未收攝不應收攝。”

Trans.: To the monks who have been performed with the formal act of censure yet [still] have five features, [you must] not exempt them [when] they have not been exempted! Which five? 1) Showing no respect to the Order at all, and not being subdued with hairs fallen; 2) not initiating to be exempted [from the act]; 3) not showing with homage; 4) not begging to be exempted [from the act] while abiding in the end of the boundary; and 5) not giving up being quarrelsome [and so on] anymore. [Therefore,] to those who have aforementioned five features and are performed with the formal act of censure, [you must] not exempt them [when] they have not been exempted!

§ 1.8b69

del yang chos lnga dang ldan na bsdigs pa'I las byas pa las ma phyung $ // dang ma dbyung shIg / lnga gang zhe na rgyal po la dpag tshol ba dang dbang yod pa70 la dpag tshol ba dang / gang zag la dpag tshol ba

67 The Old Tibetan text and PL (Tib.) don’t contain the vadati which PL (Skt.) preserves. Cf. § 1.9a.

68 The Chinese text here implies that its Vorlage, or the translation itself, is fragmental: there is no text that corresponds to the text between the evamjātīyaḥ at the end of PL (Skt.) § 1.7, and paṃcabhir dharmaiḥ samanvāgatas tarjanīyakarmakṛtaḥ nodārayitavyaḥ... tasmāc ca kalahakārakatvāc ca na pratīviramāṇīti vadaty in PL (Skt.) § 1.8. Only the translation of a sentence close to ebhiḥ paṃcabhir dharmais samanvāgataḥ pūravat* in PL (Skt.) remains (“有其五法與作令怖羯磨，苾芻若未收攝不應收攝”), whose Old Tibetan parallel is available: chos de lnga dang ldan na bsdigs pa'I las byas pa las ma phyung da*ng* ma dbyung shIg. And both the Old Tibetan (ma phyung ba las ni ma dbyung) and Chinese EK (“若未收攝不應收攝”) here suggest their Vorlage is something like *nodārayito nodārayitavyaḥ or *nosārayito nosārayitavyaḥ.

69 PL (Skt.): aparair api paṃcabhir dharmaiḥ samanvāgatas tarjanīyakarmakṛtaḥ (Yamagiwa suggests to read tarjanīyakarmakṛtaḥ nosārayitavyaḥ| katamaḥ paṃcabhiḥ | rājakulapratisaraṇo bhavati yuktakulapratisaraṇas āṃśikapratisaraṇaḥ pūravat* in PL (Skt.) § 1.8. Only the translation of a sentence close to ebhiḥ paṃcabhir dharmais samanvāgataḥ pūravat* in PL (Skt.) remains (“有其五法與作令怖羯磨，苾芻若未收攝不應收攝”), whose Old Tibetan parallel is available: chos de lnga dang ldan na bsdigs pa'I las byas pa las ma phyung da*ng* ma dbyung shIg. And both the Old Tibetan (ma phyung ba las ni ma dbyung) and Chinese EK (“若未收攝不應收攝”) here suggest their Vorlage is something like *nodārayito nodārayitavyaḥ or *nosārayito nosārayitavyaḥ.

70 The Old Tibetan text translates rājakula (pho brang 'khor du, ‘royal family’) simply as rgyal po (‘king’), which is the same as the Chinese text (‘國王’); and it also translates yuktakula (bskos pa 'dus pa'i sar, ‘people in charge’) as dbang yod pa (‘people with power’), while the
dang mur ’dug la dpag tshol ba dang / dge ’dun la dpag myI tshol ba ste / de lnga ’ang snga ma bzhIn nO /

“何謂為五？一、依國王；二、依諸官；三、依別人；四、依外道；五、依僧伽”。如是之人不應收攝。

Trans.: Henceforth, to those who have five features and are performed with the formal act of censure, [you must] not exempt them [when] they have not been exempted! Which five? 1) Seeking refuge to kings; 2) to those with power; 3) to [other] men; 4) to heretics; yet 5) not to the Order. [To those with] five features, [do] as aforementioned!

§ 1.8c

de las yang chos lnga dang ldan na bsdigs pa’I las byas pa la ma phyung da*ng* ma dbyung shIg / lnga gang zhe na mur ’dug la bsnyend pa dang stobs pa dang bsnyen bkur byed pa dang dge ’dun la bsnyen ba{{ku}} r myI byed pa dang gnas myed par byed pa75 ste / de lnga yang snga ma bzhIn nO /

“復有五法不應收攝。云何為五？一、承事外道；二、樂親近惡友；三、供養外道；四、不願與僧伽和合；五、不願與僧伽同住。如是之人不應收攝。”

Trans.: Henceforth, to those who have five features and are performed with the formal act of censure, [you must] not exempt them [when] they

---

71 Both the Old Tibetan and Chinese texts list the gang zag la dpag tshol ba (‘依別人’) and mur ’dug la dpag tshol ba (‘依外道’) in an order that is reversed in PL.

72 It should be taken as a scribal or printing error, and should be corrected as ‘不依僧伽’.

73 PL (Skt.): aparair api paṃcācābhir dharmāḥ samāṇvāgataḥ (Yamagiwa suggests to read samāṇvāgatas) tarjānīkarmakṛto nosārayitavyaḥ | katamaḥ paṃcācāhi | āgārikadhvajāṃ dhārayati tīrthikadhvajāṃ dhārayati tīrthān sevate bhajate paryupāste anadhyācāram ācārati bhikṣuśīkṣāyāṃ na śikṣate | ekti paṃcācābhir dharmais samāṇvāgataḥ pūrvaṃvāt*.

PL (Tib.): gzhan yang bsdigs pa’i las byas pa chos lnga dang ldan pa ni bslang bar mi bya ste | lnga gang zhe na | kyim pa’i rtags ’chang ba dang | mu steğs can gnyi rtags ’chang ba dang | mu steğs can la sten cing bsnyen la bsnyen bkur byed pa dang | spyod par bya ba ma yin pa spyod pa dang | dge slong gis bslab la ma slob pa ste | chos ’di lnga zhes bya ba gong ma bzhIn du’o.

74 The Old Tibetan text gives mur ’dug la bsnyen pa dang stobs pa dang bsnyen bkur byed pa, which corresponds to tīrthān sevate bhajate paryupāste (mu stegs can la sten cing bsnyen la bsnyen bkur byed pa) in PL, but the Chinese text contains ‘樂親近惡友’ (‘like to be with evil friends’).

75 Regarding the last two of the list, the Old Tibetan and Chinese EK texts (dge ’dun la bsnyen ba{{ku}} r myI byed pa ‘不願與僧伽和合’ and gnas myed par byed pa ‘不願與僧伽同住’) actually correspond to the last two of the list in PL (samghasya ca alābhāya avasādāya cetayaty, dge ’dun gnyi myed pa med par byed pa dang | gnas med par brtson par byed pa) in the next section § 1.8d.
have not been exempted! Which five? 1) Attending to the heretics; 2) serving the heretics; 3) honoring the heretics; yet 4) not honoring the Order; 5) not dwelling in the Order. [To those with] five features, [do] as aforementioned!

§ 1.8d

yang chos lnga dang ldan ba ste de ni dge slong pha rnams la kha ngan zer ba dang khro ba dang bsdigs pa dang my" [23r3] spyad pa spyod pa dang dge slong pha’I bslab pa myI slob pa77 ste / chos de lnga dang ldan ba’I bsdigs Θ pa’I byas pa las ma phyung dang ma dbyung shIg /

“復有五法不應收攝：一、罵苾芻；二、瞋恨；三、訶責；四、行不應行；五、苾芻學處而不修習。”

Trans.: And to those with five features, i.e. 1) speaking ill of the monks; 2) being angry with the monks; 3) censuring the monks; 4) performing bad conduct; 5) not taking the monk’s training, to those who have these five features and are performed with the formal act of censure, [you must] not exempt them [when] they have not been exempted!

§ 1.9a

chos lnga dang ldan na bsdIgs pa’I las byas pa’I Θ dge slong pha ma phyung dang phyung shIg / lnga gang zhe na dge ’dun la ri mo gus par byed

76 PL (Skt.): aparair api paṃcābhir dharmais samanvāgataḥ (Yamagiwa suggests to read samanvāgatas) tarjanīyakarmaṇkta nosārayitavyaḥ | katamaṇḍ paṃcābhirbhī | bhikṣūn ākroṣati roṣayati paribhāṣate • samghasya ca alābhāya avasādāya cetatyay | ebhiḥ paṃcābhir dharmāḥ pūrvvat*.

PL (Tib.): gzhan yang bsdigs pa’i las byas pachos lnga dang ldan pa ni bslang bar mi bya ste | lnga gang zhe na | dge slong rnams la gshe bar byed pa dang | khro bar byed pa dang | kha zer bar byed pa dang | dge ’dun gyi nyped pa med par byed pa dang | gnas med par brtson par byed pa ste | chos ’di lnga dang zhes bya ba’i bar gong ma bzhin du’o.

77 Regarding the last two of the list, the Old Tibetan and Chinese EK texts (myI spyad pa spyod pa ‘行不應行’ and dge slong pha’I bslab pa myI slob pa ‘苾芻學處而不修習’) actually correspond to the last two of the list in PL (anadhyācāram ācaryat, spyydy byar bya ma yin pa spyod pa; and bhikṣuṣīksāyām na śikṣate, dge slong gis bslab pa la ni slob pa) in the former section § 1.8c.

78 PL (Skt.): paṃcābhis tu dharmais samanvāgataḥ (Yamagiwa suggests to read samanvāgatas) tarjanīyakarmaṇkta osārayitavyaḥ | katamaṇḍ paṃcābhir dharmāḥ | utkacaprakacah samgha roma pāṭaya nissaraṇaṃ praśante yācate | kalakahākaraṅkta na pratīvatmāmi • vadati • ebhiḥ paṃcābhī dharmās samanvāgatas tarjanīyakarmaṇkta osārayitavyaḥ.

PL (Tib.): yang bsdigs pa’i las byas pachos lnga dang ldan pa ni bslang bar bya ste | lnga gang zhe na | skra gyen du ’greng pa lta bu dang | skra zhih pa lta bu dang | dge ’dun la spu sa la ltung ba lta bur byed pa dang | ’byung bar bskyod pa dang | mtshungs par nye bar ston pa dang | mtshams kyi nang du ’dug ste bslang ba gsol ba dang | ’thab krol byed pa nyid spong ba ste | chos ’di lnga dang zhes bya ba gong ma bzhin du’o.
pa dang / [23r4] spu bzhIn du 'bab pa dang dbyung bar rtsom dang phyag 'tshal bar stond pa dang mtshams kyI Θ mtha’{μu} r ’dug cing dbyung bar gsol ba’o / de bas na thab mo byed pa la slar gtong 79 zhIng Θ chos de lnga dang ldan na bsdigs pa’I las byas pa las ma phyung dang ma dbyung shIg //

“若有五法應可收攝。云何為五? 一、於僧伽處自現恭勤不生輕慢; 二、稀求拔濟; 三、恒申敬禮; 四、界內而住請求收攝; 五、自云: ‘我今於此闡諦更不復作。’ 是謂為五。若未收攝者，應可收攝。”

Trans.: Concerning the monks who have been performed with the formal act of censure yet [now] have five features, [they could] be exempted [when] they have not been exempted! Which five? 1) Showing great respect to the Order, and being fully subdued with hairs fallen; 2) initiating to be exempted [from the act]; 3) showing with homage; 4) begging to be exempted [from the act] while abiding in the end of the boundary; and 5) giving up being quarrelsome [and so on] anymore. [Therefore,] to those who have aforementioned five features and are performed with the formal act of censure, [you could] exempt them [when] they have not been exempted!

§ 1.9b80

de las yang chos lnga dang ldan na bsdigs pa’I las byas pa las ma phyung dang phyung shIg / Θ lnga gang zhe na rgyal po la dpag myI tshol ba dang dbang yod pa la dpag myI tshol ba dang / gang zag Θ la dpag myI tshol ba dang / mur ’dug la dpag myI tshol ba dang dge ’dun la dpag tshol [23r6] ba dang de lnga ’ang snga ma bzhIn no //

“復有五法應可收攝。云何為五? 一、不依國王; 二、不依諸官; 三、不依別人; 四、不依外道; 五、不依僧伽81，是名為五。”

Trans.: Henceforth, concerning those who have five features and are performed with the formal act of censure, [they could] be exempted [when] they have not been exempted! Which five? 1) Not seeking refuge to kings;

79 The Old Tibetan text and PL (Tib.) do not contain the vadati (‘自云’), which PL (Skt.) and the Chinese EK preserve.
80 PL (Skt.): aparair api paṃcابhir dharmais samanvāgataḥ (Yamagiwa suggests to read samanvāgas) tarjanīyakarmaṇa osārayitavyaḥ | katamaḥ pāmcaḥbhīḥ | na rājakulapratisaṇaḥ bhavati na yuktakulapratisaṇaḥ na tīrthikapratisaṇaḥ saṃghapratisaṇaḥ na pudgalapratisaṇaḥ | ebhiḥ pāmcabhibhā dharmāḥ samanvāgataḥ pūrvvavat*. PL (Tib.): gzhan yang bsdigs pa’i las byas pa chos lnga dang ldan pa ni bslang bar bya ste | lnga gang zhe na | pho brang ’khor du mi rton pa dang | bsksos pa’ dus pa’i sar mi rton pa dang | mu stegs can la mi rton pa dang | gang zag la mi rton pa dang | dge ’dun la rton pa ste | chos ’di lnga dang ldan pa ni zhes bya ba gong ma bzhin du’o.
81 It should be taken as a scribal or printing error, and should be corrected as ‘依僧伽’.
2) nor to those with power; 3) nor to [other] men; 4) nor to heretics; yet 5) to the Order. [To those with] five features, [do] as aforementioned!

§ 1.9c

de las yang chos lnga dang ldan na bsdzigs pa’i las byas pa las ma phyung dang phyung shlg / Inga gang zhe na mur ’dug la myI snyand pa dang / myI stobs pa dang bsnyen bkur byed pa myed pa dang dge ’dun la bsnyen ba{s}r byed pa dang gnas yod par byed pa ste // [23r7] de lnga yang snga ma bzhIn no /

“復有五法與解令怖羯磨。云何為五？一、不於外道而作承事；二、不親近悪友；三、不供養外道；四、願與僧伽和合；五、願與僧伽同住，是名為五。”

Trans.: Henceforth, concerning those who have five features and are performed with the formal act of censure, [they could] be exempted [when] they have not been exempted! Which five? 1) Not attending to the heretics; 2) not serving the heretics; 3) not honouring the heretics; yet 4) honouring the Order; 5) dwelling in the Order. [To those with] five features, [do] as aforementioned!

§ 1.9d

yang chos lnga dang ldan ba ste / de nl dge slong pha mams la kha ngan myI zer ba dang / myI khrim ba dang myI bsdzigs pa dang myI spyad myI spyod pa dang / dge slong pha’I bslab pa slob pa ste / bsdzigs pa’I las byas pa las ma phyung dang phyung shlg / dbyung ba nl ’di ltar bya’o //
“復有五法與解令怖羯磨。云何為五？一、不罵苾芻；二、不瞋恨；三、不訶責；四、行所應行；五、於苾芻學處而常修習，是名為五。既調伏已應與收攝羯磨。”

**Trans.:** And concerning those with five features, i.e. 1) not speaking ill of the monks; 2) nor being angry with the monks; 3) nor censuring the monks; 4) nor performing bad conduct; 5) taking the monk’s training, [those who have these five features and] are performed with the formal act of censure, [they could] be exempted [when] they have not been exempted! Such is the way to exempt.

§ 1.10

[gson cig btson ba ’I dge ’dun rnam bs dag dge glos gna pa leb rga nas tshIg ’di skad ces smra ba’i bar du ste //

“為前方便，准上應知，乃至半豆盧喻得迦等作如是言。”

**Trans.:** Seating couch is prepared [and, and so on, until] the monks of Leb rga na pa saluted with joined hands, saying...

§ 1.11

gson cig bs tson ba’I dge ’dun rnam bs dag dge glos gna pa leb rga na *pa* thab mo byed log po byed ’deg pa byed tshIg ngan du smra rtsod par byed de / de dge glos gna pa leb rga na ’I dge ’dun rnam la ’ang rtag par ’thab du [23v2] ’dzud ’deg du

85 PL (skt.): evaṃ ca punar osārayitavyaḥ | śayanāsanaprajñaptiṃ kṛtvā gaṇḍīṃ ākoṭya prṣṭhaṇvantikā bhikṣuṃ samanuyuyā sarvasaṃghe sannisṭhante sannipatite Pāṇḍulohitakair bhikṣubhir yathāvṛddhikāyā kṛtvā vṛddhānte utkuṭkṣena sthitā añjaliṃ pragrhyā idam syād vacanīyaḥ (Yamagiwa suggests to read vacanīyaṃ).

PL (Tib.): bs lang ba ni ’di ltar bya ste | gnas mal bshams la gaṇḍī brdungs te | dris pa’i tshig gis dge glos gnam la yang dag par bs go la | dge ’dun thams cad tshogs shing mthun par gyur pa dang | dge glos dmar ser can gyis rga na jis ji la ba bzhin du gdung ba byas la | rga na jis kyi mdung du tsgog tseg por ’dug ste | thal mo sbyar ba btud nas tshig ’di skad ces.

86 cf. § 1.3, n.43.

87 PL (skt.): śṛṇotu bhadantāḥ saṃghaḥ | vayaṃ Pāṇḍulohitikā (Yamagiwa suggests to read Pāṇḍulohitakā) bhikṣuṣvāh kalabdhakāraḥ bhaṇḍanaśārakaḥ vignāraḥ kāvivādaśārakā ādhiķariṇikāḥ | te vayaṃ abhisāṃ samghaḥ adhikaraṃsṇry utpādayāmo yena saṃghaḥ kalabdhajāto vighṛhito vivādān āpānah | teṣām asmaṃkāḥ Pāṇḍulohitakānām bhikṣuṣvām kalabdhakārakānām bhaṇḍanakārakānām vignāraḥ kāvivādānāṃ ādhiķariṇikānāṃ saṃghena tarjāṇyāṃ karma kṛṇaḥ | te vayaṃ tarjāṇyākarmakṛṣṭāni utkacaprakācā (Yamagiwa suggests to read tarjāṇyākarmakṛṣṭā utkacaprakācā) saṃghaḥ roma pātayaṃ nissaraṇaṃ pravarttāyaṃ tāṃ śāmīcāṃ upadarsāyaṃ antassāryāṃ sthitvā osārayāṃ yācamaḥ • kalabdhakārakatvā ca prativiramanām asaṃrayāt asmaṃkāḥ bhadantās saṃgha (Yamagiwa suggests to read saṃgha) Pāṇḍulohitakāṃ bhikṣuṃ kalabdhākāraḥ vignāraḥ ādhiķariṇikāṃs tarjāṇyākarmakṛṣṭān anukampañca anukampāṃ upādāya | evaṃ dvir api śri api.
‘dzud de tshIg ngan gyIs smra bar ‘dzud dge ’dun rnam s tso d par btsud de / de’I phyi*r* bdag la dge ’dun rnam kyls bsdi gs pa’I las bgyIs de / bdag la bsdi gs pa’I las bgyIs pa na dge ’dun la rI mo shIn du gus par bgyid / {{spu}} / spu bzhIn du ’bab par bgyid / ’byung bar rtson[23v3] phyag ’tshal ba ’ang bstand mtshams kyl mtha’{{mu}}\(r\) ’dug cing bhyung bar gso / thab mor Θ bgyI\(d\) pa de ’ang slar spon na / btsun ba’I dge ’dun rnam kyls bdag dge slong leb rgan pa Θ bsdlgs pa’I las bgyIs pa las bhyung bar gso / brtse ba can brtse ba’I phyir ro\(^88\) // de bzhIn du lan gnyIs lan gsum du’o //

“大德僧伽聽！我苾芻半豆盧哂得迦等是鬨亂者、是諍競者，我便數數舉發諍事，常令僧伽不安樂住。由是僧伽於我等輩為作令怖羯磨。我得羯磨已於僧伽中極現恭勤不生輕慢，悕求拔濟恒申敬禮，界內而住請求收攝，我於鬨諍永為止息。願大德僧伽與我半豆盧哂得迦等解令怖羯磨。是能愍者，願哀愍故。

Trans.: ‘Listen, the Venerable Order! We the monks of Leb rgan pa were quarrelsome, hostile, assaultive, ready to insult, and disputative, and hence made the Buddhist monks always to be quarrelsome, assaultive, ready to insult, and to dispute with monks. Therefore, the Order performed the formal act of censure to us. After being performed with the formal act of censure, we show great respect to the Order, become fully subdued with hairs fallen, initiate to be exempted [from the act], show with homage, beg to be exempted [from the act] while abiding in the end of the boundary, and [now] give up being quarrelsome [and so on] anymore. [Here I] request you, the Venerable Order, [to grant] the formal act of exemption to us, the monks of Leb rgan pa who haven been performed with the formal act of censure! [You are] sympathisers since you’ve taken compassion!’ the second and third are performed likewise.

---

\(^88\) The Old Tibetan text *brtse ba can brtse ba’I phyir* is close to the Chinese parallel ‘是能愍者，願哀愍故’ , and both are translated from PL (Skt.): *anukampakah anukampām upādāya*. But PL (Tib.) allocates the sentence at the beginning of the request of exemption.
§ 1.12

de nas dge slong pha gcig gIs gsol ba Θ gyls la // las byos shIg // gcig btsun ba'I dge 'dun mams dge slong Ο leb rgan pa 'di thab mo byed log po byed 'deg pa byed pa {byed} tshig ngan du smra rtsod par byed [23v5] de / dge slong pha'I dge 'dun mams la 'ang rtag par 'thab du 'dzud 'deg du 'dzud / Θ tshIg ngan gyls smra bar 'dzud dge 'dun mams *rtsod* par 'dzud pa de'I phyir / dge 'dun mams Θ kyls dge slong pha leb rgan pa thab mo can 'di la bsdigs pa'I las bgyis te / [23v6] bsdIgs pa'I las bgyis pas na / dge 'dun la rl mo shIIn du gus par bgyIs spu bzhIn du 'bab par bgyIs 'byung bar brtsams phyag 'tshal ba 'ang bstand mtshams kyi mthar 'dug cing dbyung bar yang gsal thab mor bgyId pa de yang slar spangs te / de dge 'dun gyl [23v7] dus la bab cing bzod na dge 'dun mams kyls gnong shIg / dge 'dun gyls dge slong pha leb rgan 'di la bsdIgs pa'I las bgyIs pa las phyung shIg / de nI gsol ba'o /

“次一苾芻為白羯磨” 90: ‘大德僧伽聽！此半豆盧呬得迦諸苾芻等鬪亂僧伽令起諍競，復便數數舉發諍事，常令僧伽不安樂住。僧伽先與半豆盧呬得迦諸苾芻等作令怖羯磨。此半豆盧呬得迦諸苾芻等得羯磨已，於僧伽中極現恭勤不生輕慢，今從僧伽乞解令怖羯磨。若僧伽時至聽者，僧伽應許僧伽今與半豆盧呬得迦諸苾芻等解令怖羯磨。’ 白如是。’

Trans.: Then one monk brought the motion and performed the act, requesting: ‘Listen, the Venerable Order! This [group of monks] of Leb rgan pa who were quarrelsome, hostile, assaultive, ready to insult, and disputative,

89 PL (Skt.): tataḥ paścād ekena bhikṣuṇā jñaptiṃ kṛtvā karma kartavyaṃ | śṛṇotu bhadantāḥ saṃghaḥ | ime Pāṇḍulohitikā (Yamagiwa suggests to read Pāṇḍulohitakā) bhikṣavāḥ kalahākārākā yāvad ādhikaraṇikāḥ | ta ete abhīkṣṇaṃ saṃghē adhikaraṇāṇy utpādāyanti • yena saṃghāḥ kalahajāto viharati bhaṇḍanaṇātā vighriḥ vivādām āpanaḥ | tad eṣāṃ saṃghena kalahākārākā iti tarjanīyakarma kṛtaṃ | ta ete tarjanīyakarmākṛtā utkacacakraṇāṇy saṃghē roma patayanti • nissaraṇaṃ pravarttayanti sāmīcīṃ (Yamagiwa suggests to read sāmīcīṃ) upadarsāvyante antaḥśīmāyāṃ sthitvā osāraṇāṃ yācaṃte kalahākāraṃvatvā ca prativrīmāmā iti vai dantī • satc samghasya prāptakālaṃ kṣametāṃ sāmīcīṃ samgho yat saṃghāḥ Pāṇḍulohitakān bhikṣuṃ osāravyati nissaraṇaṃ pravarttayati • eṣā jñaptiḥ.

PL (Tib.): de'i 'og tu dge slong gcig gis gsol ba byas te las bya'o || dge 'dun btsun pa mams gsan du gsol | dge slong dmar ser can 'di dag ni 'thab krol byig pa nas | rtsod pa'i gzhi byig pa'i bar du ste | de dag gis dge 'dun la yang dang yang du rtsod pa'i gzhi bskyed de | des na dge 'dun 'thab krol dang | mthang 'dru ba dang | rtsod pa dang | 'gyed pa byung zhung gnas pas | dge 'dun gys 'thab krol byig pa 'di rnam la bsdigs pa'i phrin las mdzad lags te | bsdigs pa'i phrin las mdzad lags pa 'di rnam skra gyn du 'greng ba lta bu dang | skra zhig pa lta bur dge 'dun la spus la ltung ba lta bur byig | 'byung bar bskyod | mthung ba par nye bar ston | mthams kyi nang du mchis nas | bslang ba gsol te | 'thab krol byig pa nyid kyang spong ngo zhes mchi na | gal te dge 'dun gyi dus la bab cing bzod na | dge 'dun gys gnang bar mdzod cig dang | dge 'dun gys dge slong dmar ser can mams bslang bar mdzad do || 'di ni gsol ba'o.

90 The editors of the Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō report that in the recensions from kunai-shō zushō-ryō and three dynasties, it is ‘次一苾芻為白羯磨’, and this reading should be preferred and repunctuated as ‘次一苾芻為白羯磨’. Cf. § 1.3, n.44.
and hence made the Buddhist monks always to be quarrelsome, assaultive, ready to insult, and to dispute with monks. Therefore, the Order performed the formal act of censure to the monks of Leb rgan pa who were quarrelsome [and so on]. After being performed with the formal act of censure, they showed great respect to the Order, became fully subdued with hairs fallen, initiated to be exempted [from the act], showed with homage, begged to be exempted [from the act] while abiding in the end of the boundary, and gave up being quarrelsome [and so on] anymore. [If the Order] consent that [it’s] the right time for the Order, the Order should grant the formal act of exemption to the monks of Leb rgan pa who have been performed with the formal act of censure!’ This is the motion.

§ 1.13

las nl ’di ltar bya’o // gson cig btson b’a l dge ’dun rnams / dge slong leb rgan pa // [ITJ 596.24r1 (‘KA 67’)] S // ’di thab myo byed log po byed ’deg pa byed tshIlg ngan du smra rtsod par byed de / de dge slong pha’I dge ’dun rnams la yang rtag du ’thab du ’dzud ’deg du ’dzud tshIlg ngan gyls smra bar ’dzud dge ’dun rnams rtsod par ’dzud de / de’I phyir dge slong leb rgan pa thab mo can ’dI la dge ’dun rnams kyls bsdi gs’al las [24r2] bgyls t e / bsdi gs’al las de bygl s

91 PL (Skt.): tataḥ karma kartavyam* | śṛṇotu bhadantāḥ saṃghaḥ | ime Pāṇḍulohitakā bhīṣavaḥ kalakahārakā yāvad ādhikaraṇīkās | ete abhīkṣaṇaḥ saṃghaḥ adhikaraṇīyanaḥ utpādayanti yena saṃghaḥ kalakahāraḥ viharati bhāṇḍanaḥajātō vigṛhiḥ vivādaḥ āpānaḥ | tad eṣāṃ saṃghena kalakahārakā iti tarjanīyakarmā kṛtaṃ | ete tarjanīyakarmakṛtaḥ utkacaprakācaḥ (Yamagiwa suggests to read utkacaprakācaḥ) saṃghena pātayanti nissaraṇaṃ pravarttayanti sāmīcīṃ upadarsāyanti antahśīme sthitāḥ (Yamagiwa suggests to read antahśīmāyāṃ sthitāḥ) osaraṇāṃ yācante kalakahārakatvāc ca pratīviramāma iti vaddanti | tat saṃghaḥ Pāṇḍulohitakān bhīṣavāṃ kalakahārakāṃs tarjanīyakarmakṛtāṁ osaraṇayati | yeśāṃ āyuṣmatāṃ kṣamate Pāṇḍulohitakān bhīṣvīṃ kalakahārakāṃs tarjanīyakarmakṛtāṃ osaraṇayati te tūṣṇīṃ na kṣamate bhaśāntāṃ | osārītā saṃghena Pāṇḍulohitakān bhīṣavāḥ kalakahārakāḥ tarjanīyakarmakṛtāḥ | kṣāntam anujñātām saṃghena yasmāt tūṣṇīṃ evam etad dhārayāmi.

PL (Tib.): las bya ba ni dge ’dun bsUn pa rnams gsan du bsol | dge slong dmar ser can ’di dag ni ’thab kroI bygI paI zhes bya ba nas | rtsod paI gZhi bygI paI bar du st e | de dag gis dge ’dun la rtsod paI gZhi bsKyed de | des na dge ’dun ’thab kroI dang | mtshang ’dru ba dang | rtsod pa dang | ’gyed pa byung zhiNg gnas pas | dge ’dun gyIs ’thab kroI bygI paI ’di dnyIs la bsdi gs’al paI phrin las mdzad te | bsdi gs’al paI phrin las mdzad lags pa ’di dnyIs | skra gyen du ’greng ba lta bu dang | skra zhig pa lta bur dge ’dun la spu sa la ltung ba lta bur bygI | ’byung bar bsKyod | mtshungs par nye bar ston | mtshams kyi nang du mchis nas bsIg ba bsol te | ’thab kroI bygI paI nyid kyang spong ngsi zhes mchi na | de’i slad du dge ’dun gyIs dge slong dmar ser can ’thab kroI bygI paI bsdi gs’al paI phrin las mdzad lags pa rnams bslang bar mdzad na | tshe dang ldan pa gang dag dge slong dmar ser can ’thab kroI bygI paI bsdi gs’al paI phrin las mdzad lags pa rnams bslang bar bsod pa de dag ni cang ma gsungs shig | gang dag mi bsod pa de dag ni gsunings shig | ’di ni lsa bsrod pa dang po st e | de bzhin du las bsrod pa gnyIs dang gsum gyI bar du bsrod pa bya’o | dge ’dun gyIs bsod cing gnang nas | dge ’dun gyIs dge slong dmar ser can ’thab kroI bygI paI bsdi gs’al paI phrin las mdzad lags pa rnams bslang bar mdzad lags te | ’di ltar cang mi gsung bas de de bzhin du ’dzin to.
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pas na dge ’dun la rI mo shIn du gus par bgyIs / spu bzhIn du ’bab par bgyIs
dbyung bar brtsams phyag ’tshal ba yang bstand mtshams kyi mthar ’dug cing
dbyung ba yang gsoI thab mor bgyIs pa de yang slar spangs te / dge ’dun rnnams
kyls dge [24r3] slong leb rgan pa ’dI bsdigs pa’I las bgyIs pa de las ’byIn na / tshe
dang Idan ba rnnams las Θ dge slong leb rgan *pa* ’di bsdIgs pa’i las byas pa
las dbyung bar gga la bzod pa de dag nI cang ma gsung shIg / myI bzod pa nI
gsungs shIg / ’dI ni las kyl tshig dang po ste / las kyl tshig de [24r4] bzhIn du lan
gnyIs lan gsum du byos shIg / dge ’dun gyls dge slong leb rgan pa Θ bsdIgs
pa’I las byas pa las phyung ste / dge ’dun rnnams kyls bzod cing gnang bas na
Θ cang myI gsung ste de bzhIn du ’dzin to // * * //

“大德僧伽聽! 此半豆盧呬得迦諸苾芻等, 鬥亂僧伽令起諍競, 復
便數數舉發諍事, 常令僧伽不安樂住。僧伽先與半豆盧呬得迦諸苾芻等
作令怖羯磨。此半豆盧呬得迦諸苾芻等得羯磨已, 於僧伽中極現恭勤、
不生輕慢, 今從僧伽乞解令怖羯磨。僧伽今與半豆盧呬得迦諸苾芻等
解令怖羯磨者默然, 若不許者說。此是初羯磨。
第二、第三亦如是說。
僧伽已與半豆盧呬得迦諸苾芻等解令怖羯磨竟。僧伽已聽許, 由其默
然故, 我今如是持。’”

Trans.: Thus is how to perform the act. ‘Listen, the Venerable Order! This
[group of monks] of Leb rgan pa who were quarrelsome, hostile, assaultive,
ready to insult, and disputative, and hence made the Buddhist monks always
to be quarrelsome, assaultive, ready to insult, and to dispute with monks.
Therefore, the Order performed the formal act of censure to the monks of
Leb rgan pa. After being performed with the formal act of censure, they
showed great respect to the Order, became fully subdued with hairs fallen,
initiated to be exempted [from the act], showed great homage, begged to be
exempted [from the act] while abiding in the end of the boundary, and gave
up being quarrelsome [and so on] anymore. The Order grants the formal act
of exemption to the monks of Leb rgan pa who have been performed with
the formal act of censure. The Order that consents to grant the formal act of
exemption to those monks of Leb rgan pa who have been performed with the
formal act of censure, speak no word! Whoever doesn’t consent, speak!’ Thus
is the speech of the first act. The second and third were performed likewise.
‘The Order removed those monks of Leb rgan pa, for whom the formal act of
censure had been performed, from such a state. The Order consents and grants
[that, so the monks] speak no word.’ Thus I take.
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Symbols used in the Diplomatic Edition

I   gi log
M   anusvāra
$   page initial sign head mgo-yig
*abc* insertions: letter, word, or phrase written below the line
{abc} letters deleted by a tiny stroke
{{abc}} letters erased
[#a#] page and line number
Θ   string hole
*** illustration at the end of text section

Abbreviations

baiyijie = Genbenshuoyiqieyou bu baiyijie 根本說一切有部百一羯磨 (T 1453)
Chin. = Chinese
D = Derge Tanjur
EK = Mūlasarvāstivāda-Ekottarakarmaśataka
IOL Tib = Indian Office Library Tibetan
ITJ = IOL Tib J
PL = Pāṇḍulohitakavastu
PT = Pelliot tibétain
Q = Peking Tanjur
Skt. = Sanskrit
T = Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō, ed. Takakusu, Junjiro and Kaigyoku Watanabe. 100 vols.
Tib. = Tibetan
zashi = Genbeshuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye zashi 根本說一切有部毘奈耶雜事 (T 1451).
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