

Theories on the Foundation of the Nuns' Order – A Critical Evaluation

ANĀLAYO

Abstract

The present article critically reviews four theories regarding the foundation of the order of nuns: (I) the suggestion that the account of the foundation of the nuns' order was devised only after the division between the Sthavira and the Mahāsāṃghika schools; (II) the assumption that an alternative account of this event can be found in the *Maitrisimit*; (III) the conjecture that nuns were in existence before Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī went forth; and (IV) the hypothesis that the order of nuns came into being only after the Buddha had passed away.

I. The Account of the Foundation of the Nuns' Order – Only a Product of the Sthavira tradition(s)?

According to the report given in the Pāli *Vinaya* and in a discourse in the *Aṅguttara-nikāya*, during a visit paid by to his hometown Kapilavastu the Buddha was asked by Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī to grant permission for women to go forth.¹ Though she made her appeal for altogether three times, the Buddha each time refused her request. Once the Buddha had left Kapilavastu, Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī cut off her hair, dressed in robes, and together with a group of like-minded Śākyan ladies followed the Buddha to Vaiśālī. At Vaiśālī, Ānanda intervened on her behalf and convinced the Buddha to accede to Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī's request. When permitting women to go forth, however, the Buddha predicted that the founding of an order of nuns would shorten the duration of his dispensation to five-hundred years.

The prediction that due to the coming into existence of an order of nuns the Dharma will last only five-hundred years recurs in the *Vinayas* of the Dharmaguptaka, 'Haimavata', Mahīśāsaka, and (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda traditions, preserved in Chinese translation.² Though the Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya*

does not give a full account of the foundation of the order of nuns, the same is described in a discourse in the *Madhyama-āgama* collection,³ which is generally held to be of Sarvāstivāda provenance.⁴ Recurring also in a number of other texts,⁵ such a prediction is, however, absent from the Mahāsāṃghika *Vinaya* brought by Fa-xian (法顯) from India.⁶

In the context of an examination of various predictions regarding the decline of the true Dharma, Nattier (1991: 32) notes that a prediction about the impending decline of the teachings within five-hundred years due to the founding of an order of nuns is not found "in the surviving literature of any of the Mahāsāṃghika schools". She then concludes that "the idea of blaming the early demise of the Dharma on the nuns developed sometime after the initial sectarian division between the Sthavira and Mahāsāṃghika schools, but before any further subdivisions within the Sthavira branch had taken place". The "date of the emergence of this tradition should therefore be placed during the period 340-200 BCE".⁷

Closer inspection of the Chinese version of the Mahāsāṃghika *Vinaya*, however, reveals that this absence is merely a case of abbreviation, as this *Vinaya* refers to a more detailed account of Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī's going forth preserved in a discourse.⁸ Besides the abbreviated reference in the Mahāsāṃghika *Vinaya* preserved in Chinese, a Sanskrit version of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottarvāda *Vinaya* contains the full episode of the foundation of the order of nuns, and therewith also the reference to the diminished duration of the true Dharma, indicating that it will last for only five-hundred years, instead of a thousand.⁹

Thus the Buddha's refusal to allow women to go forth and his prediction that the founding of an order of nuns will shorten the life time of his teaching are elements also found in texts of the Mahāsāṃghika tradition(s).

II. An Alternative Account in the *Maitrisimit*?

In addition to the accounts given in the various *Vinayas*, according to Laut (1991) an alternative description of how the order of nuns came into being can be found in the *Maitrisimit*, parts of which have been preserved in Uighur and Tocharian. Laut reports that in an Uighur version of this text Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī tries to offer a robe to the Buddha out of gratitude for having received permission to go forth.¹⁰

ANĀLAYO: Theories on the Foundation of the Nun's Order

The relevant part of the *Maitrisimit*, however, is merely an embellished version of the events described in the introductory section of the *Dakkhiṇavibhaṅga-sutta*.¹¹ The *Dakkhiṇavibhaṅga-sutta*, its two Chinese discourse parallels and a Tibetan version preserved as a *sūtra* quotation in Śamathadeva's commentary on the *Abhidharmakośa* record an occasion when Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī, who apparently was a stream-enterer at the time of this event,¹² tries to offer a robe to the Buddha, but is told that she should better offer it to the monastic community.

Laut concedes that the *Maitrisimit* does not explicitly refer to the foundation of the nuns' order, though according to him this should be understood to be implicit in the account, since going forth would be the necessary condition for Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī's claim to have become a stream-enterer.¹³

Thus Laut's identification of this section in the *Maitrisimit* as an alternative account of the foundation of the order of nuns rests on his assumption that one needs to go forth in order to be able to attain stream-entry. A stream-enterer, he explains, is one who has reached the first level of the 'monastic' salvation career in Buddhism.¹⁴ His suggestion seems to confound the monastic *saṅgha* with the *saṅgha* of noble ones. Such confusion can easily happen, since whereas the early discourses describe recollecting the *saṅgha* in terms of the community of noble ones,¹⁵ the standard formula for taking refuge in the *saṅgha* speaks of the community of monks.¹⁶ Yet, these two types of *saṅgha* are not identical and they do not imply that one has to go forth to attain stream-entry, or even that those who have attained stream-entry need to go forth.

On the contrary, the early discourses report a number of cases where lay people attain stream-entry and even higher stages of awakening without going forth. A famous example would be the householder Anāthapiṇḍika, who according to the canonical sources became a stream-entrant on his first meeting with the Buddha,¹⁷ but passed away after a life of devoted service to the monastic community while still being a layman.¹⁸ According to the *Mahāvaccagotta-sutta* and its Chinese parallels, quite a substantial number – "over five-hundred" – of lay disciples of the Buddha had progressed considerably further on the path to awakening by reaching the stage of non-returning.¹⁹ Not only non-returning, but even full awakening appears to have been within reach of the laity, as the case of Yasa suggests, who apparently went forth only after having become an *arahant*.²⁰

Thus the attainment of stream-entry does not require going forth and these two events can take place quite independent of each other. In fact, the *Maitrisimit* repeatedly refers to Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī as "queen" or "lady",²¹ which suggests that, at least from the perspective of this text, she was still a lay-woman when she attempted to offer a robe to the Buddha. This is not the case for all versions of this event, as one record of her attempt to offer a robe to the Buddha, preserved in Chinese translation, explicitly introduces her as a nun.²² Whether she was a nun at the time of attempting to donate a robe to the Buddha or not, her attainment of stream-entry does not stand in any particular relation to the foundation of the order of nuns, hence the *Maitrisimit* does not provide an alternative account of how the order of nuns came into existence.

III. Nuns Before Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī's Going Forth?

Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī 's attempt to offer a robe to the Buddha has been the basis for yet another hypothesis, based on the account of this offer given in the *Dakkhinaṅgavibhaṅga-sutta*. Williams (2000: 169) notes that according to the earlier part of this discourse Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī "keeps the five precepts. This clearly implies that this is meant to have taken place before she was part of the Saṅgha, members of which adhere to ten precepts for novices, and many more for those who had taken higher ordination ... she is thus depicted as a lay person".

For her to be a laywoman, however, conflicts with a listing of recipients of gifts in a later part of the *Dakkhinaṅgavibhaṅga-sutta*, which mentions gifts given to *bhikkhūṇīs*. If at the time of this discourse Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī had not yet gone forth, a reference to other nuns would be an anachronism, as according to the canonical accounts of the foundation of the nuns' order she was the first nun in the Buddha's dispensation. Williams (2000: 170) concludes that "it would seem ... that this is evidence of the existence of bhikkhūṇīs *before* Mahāprajāpatī requested the going forth".²³ Williams also envisages an alternative explanation, according to which "this sutta may be an assimilation of one story with another".²⁴

Closer examination of the *Dakkhinaṅgavibhaṅga-sutta* suggests that Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī 's status as a lay woman is not as unequivocal as Williams assumes. The reference to the five precepts comes as part of a description of her taking refuge and becoming a disciple of the Buddha, a description that employs past participles.²⁵ Thus this passage appears to

be a report of her becoming a lay disciple at an earlier point of time, without thereby necessarily intending that at the time of the *Dakkhīnavibhaṅga-sutta* she was still observing only the five precepts.

Besides, the monastic rules appear to have come into existence only in a gradual manner, being laid down as and when occasion demanded.²⁶ Depending on how early Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī's attempt to offer a robe to the Buddha should be placed,²⁷ the contrast between the five precepts undertaken at the moment of becoming a disciple of the Buddha and the full set of monastic rules to be observed by *bhikkhus* and *bhikkhunīs* may not yet have been in existence.

Regarding the gift of a robe, a stipulation found in the different *Vinayas* makes such a gift allowable if it comes from a monastic who is a relative.²⁸ Whether this regulation was in existence already at the time of Gautamī's offer or not, it would thus have been possible for her to try to offer a robe to the Buddha while being a nun.

Thus, although the early part of the *Dakkhīnavibhaṅga-sutta* reads more naturally if one assumes that Gautamī was still a lay woman, it does not offer unambiguous proofs in support of such a conclusion. Besides, as already mentioned above, one of the Chinese parallels to the *Dakkhīnavibhaṅga-sutta* explicitly introduces Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī as a nun, so that here the reference to having taken the five precepts is made in relation to *bhikkhūnī* Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī.²⁹ According to this version at least, her attempted offer of a robe took place after she had gone forth and thus without creating any anachronism in regard to the inclusion of nuns in the listing of recipients of gifts in the same discourse.

If the *Dakkhīnavibhaṅga-sutta* is nevertheless perceived as involving an anachronism, then this need not imply that nuns were in existence before Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī went forth. Such a conclusion would not only conflict with the account of the foundation of the order of nuns in the different *Vinayas* and in several canonical discourses, but also with the listing of eminent disciples in the *Aṅguttara-nikāya* and in the *Ekottarika-āgama*, which agree on presenting her as outstanding among the nuns due to her seniority.³⁰ For Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī to be accorded this particular rank implies that she was indeed the first nun to receive ordination, which would also fit in naturally with her recurrent role in the different *Vinayas* as a spokeswoman on behalf of the nuns.

Though the *Dakkhīnavibhaṅga-sutta* and its parallels combine Gautamī's attempt to offer a robe to the Buddha with a detailed listing of recipients of gifts, this is not the case for all records of this particular meeting between her and the Buddha.³¹ This suggests the possibility that the account of the attempted offer of a robe to the Buddha and the description of recipients of gifts might originally have been two separate textual pieces. During the course of oral transmission these two parts could then have been combined to form a single account, a combination that would have to have happened early enough in order to affect the *Dakkhīnavibhaṅga-sutta* of the *Majjhima-nikāya* and its parallels.

Such combining of textual pieces of different provenance is not an uncommon feature for literature that has been orally transmitted over longer periods of time. In the *Majjhima-nikāya* itself, several discourses appear to have incorporated material that seems to stem from different contexts, or even from what originally might have been commentarial explanations.³²

Thus the second of the two alternative explanations suggested by Williams (2000: 170), according to which what appears like an anachronism in the *Dakkhīnavibhaṅga-sutta* could be explained as the outcome of a merger of two originally different texts, seems to offer a relatively straightforward solution. In contrast, hypostatizing an existence of nuns before Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī went forth would not be based on unequivocal evidence from the *Dakkhīnavibhaṅga-sutta*, it would be contradicted by one of the Chinese parallels to this discourse, and it would conflict with a broad range of other canonical sources transmitted by different Buddhist traditions regarding Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī's role in relation to the foundation of the order of nuns.³³

IV. The Nuns' Order Founded only after the Buddha's Demise?

Whereas Williams envisages the possibility that Buddhist nuns existed earlier than generally assumed, von Hinüber (2008) holds that Buddhist nuns may have come into existence at a considerably later date. Based on what he believes to be a case of outside influence on the wording in the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga* of the Pāli *Vinaya*, he comes to the conclusion that the order of nuns appears to have been founded only after the Buddha had passed away.

His proposal rests on several premises and thus requires a more detailed discussion than the theories examined so far. The essential aspects of his proposition can be summarized in four sections, which cover: (1) the occurrence of the expressions *vuṭṭhāpeti* and *pavattinī* in the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga*; (2) the Buddha's contacts with nuns in the four Pāli *Nikāyas*; (3) a comparison with the position of nuns in the Jaina tradition; and von Hinüber's hypothesis (4) on how the order of nuns would have come into being. I will examine each of these points in turn.

1) The Expressions *Vuṭṭhāpeti* and *Pavattinī*

Von Hinüber (2008: 17) notes that, instead of the term *upasampādeti*, the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga* uses *vuṭṭhāpeti* to designate the ordination of nuns. The same text also employs the term *pavattinī* to refer to a nun's teacher, instead of *upajjhāya*.³⁴ To explain this departure from the terminology used for monks, von Hinüber (2008: 19) suggests that "the vocabulary of the ordination of nuns must have come from outside Buddhism".

The case of *vuṭṭhāpeti* replacing *upasampādeti* has already been discussed at length by Shih (2000: 345-405).³⁵ According to her explanation, "*vuṭṭhāpeti* and *upasampādeti* ... represent different stages in the two-tiered ordination procedure. Only monks can give ordination (*upasampadā*) to a candidate, nuns cannot, so the functioning of each *Saṅgha* needs to be verbally differentiated. That is why *vuṭṭhāpeti* is used consistently instead of *upasampādeti* for nuns" (2000: 375-376). That is, terminology specific to the nuns would in itself not be surprising, as it might simply reflect particulars of their situation.

Whatever may be the final word on the significance of *vuṭṭhāpeti* and *pavattinī*, von Hinüber is certainly correct in pointing out that these two terms are instances of terminological similarities between the Buddhist and the Jaina traditions. Regarding such terminological similarities in general, however, there would be no a priori reason why these should imply a borrowing on the Buddhist side.

In the case of another term common to both traditions, Ticken (2001: 586) comes to the conclusion that it seems as if the "Jainas borrowed the word directly from the commentaries on the Pāli Vinaya", adding that "the Buddhist influence would in fact have gone very deeply, as we are dealing with a word here which is very common in the Jaina canon".

Tieken (2001: 585) notes that the traditional account "sets the compilation of the present Jaina canon approximately one thousand years after Mahāvīra's death", concluding that "it would seem that we have to take the tradition of the Jainas concerning the origin of the canon seriously" in the sense that the Jaina "canon might well be a relatively late compilation" (2001: 586).

In other publications, von Hinüber himself explains that the language of the Jainas tends to be closer to late and post-canonical Buddhist literature than to the older layers of the Pāli canon;³⁶ and in relation to the formulation of a particular rule for monks, he envisages the possibility that the Jainas may have been borrowing from the Buddhists.³⁷

Thus it is not self-evident that in the present case the Buddhists borrowed terms like *vuṭṭhāpeti* and *pavattinī* from the Jainas, since it cannot be excluded that the Jainas loaned such terms from the Buddhists, or else, perhaps the most probable suggestion, it may well be that both traditions drew on vocabulary current among ascetic circles in ancient India.

Even in case the Buddhists should have borrowed these terms from the Jainas – which is by no means certain – in view of the fact that the Jaina tradition was already in existence before the advent of Buddhism, such borrowing could have happened at any time. That is, there seems to be no particular reason why terminology like *vuṭṭhāpeti* and *pavattinī* should be of a later origin than *upasampādeti* and *upajjhāya*. All such terms would derive from vocabulary common in ancient India, and the same source of ancient Indian terminology could have been responsible for the terms used in relation to the order of monks as well as for those employed in relation to the subsequently founded order of nuns.

Von Hinüber (2008: 26), however, takes the terms he has highlighted in the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga* to be late, since "historical events such as the foundation of both communities, monks and nuns, could be transmitted to later generations only by the means of expression available at the time". Yet, if the order of nuns had indeed come into existence only after the Buddha's demise, those who would have faked the canonical accounts of the foundation of the order of nuns could simply have copied the terms from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*, instead of using different terms. This would, in fact, be the more probable procedure, since the forger(s) of an account to be passed off as canonical would of course keep as close as possible to the corresponding passages in the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*, in order not to give themselves away.

Employment of the same terminology as found in the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* would also be more probable in view of the natural tendency of oral transmission towards levelling and uniformity, evidenced in the circumstance that, as noted by von Hinüber (2008: 17), "*vuṭṭhāpeti* found in the Pātimokkha for nuns disappears in the Cullavagga". As von Hinüber (2008: 19) explains, in this way "the term *vuṭṭhāpana* was replaced by *upasam-padā* in the Khandhaka", "following the model of the terminology used in the rules for monks". Thus the occurrence of specific terminology like *vuṭṭhāpeti* and *pavattinī* could even be taken to point to the authenticity of the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga*.

In sum, there seems to be no need to assume that the occurrence of *vuṭṭhāpeti* and *pavattinī* in the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga* points to a coming into existence of the order of nuns at a time when the Buddha had already passed away.

2) The Buddha's Interaction with Nuns

Von Hinüber (2008: 21) highlights that "the Buddha is never mentioned as talking to any individual nun in the four Nikāyas of the SuttaPiṭaka". He further notes that "when the Buddha dies, no nun is present, only monks and gods. This is of considerable importance, because it is extremely difficult to imagine that it could have been possible to distort the report on the *nirvāṇa* and introduce or delete persons witnessing this event". "Thus while the Buddha only talks about nuns or receives reports on nuns occasionally ... he never talks to individual nuns in any text of the four Nikāyas" (2008: 22).

From a methodological perspective, it remains unclear to me why in a "contribution to the earliest history of Buddhism" – this being the title of von Hinüber's article – 'talking to individual nuns' is singled out as the only relevant type of interaction between the Buddha and the nuns. Once the canonical material is taken seriously as a potential source of historical information, which von Hinüber seems willing to do, then all instances where nuns are shown to be in some relation to the Buddha should be of relevance. That is, any hypothesis about the non-existence of nuns during the Buddha's life time would also need to take into account records of the Buddha speaking to a group of nuns, the Buddha speaking about individual nuns, the Buddha speaking about a group of nuns, individual nuns speaking to the Buddha, a group of nuns speaking to the Buddha, and

even reports about an individual nun or a group of nuns given by someone else to the Buddha. All such instances would conflict with the assumption that the order of nuns came into being only when the Buddha had already passed away.

This methodological problem of basing a hypothesis on an adequate examination of the sources becomes further aggravated by the circumstance that, in order to reach conclusions about the history of early Buddhism, a study of all relevant sources is an indispensable requirement. For conclusions of such significance, attempting a major revision of the history of early Buddhism, it is not possible to restrict one's research to the four Pāli *Nikāyas* alone. In the Pāli canon itself, the *Therīgāthā* certainly deserves to be reckoned as relevant source material at least on a par with *Nikāya* passages such as the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta*.³⁸ The same applies to any contact between the Buddha and nuns reported in the *Vinaya*.³⁹ Of even greater importance would be extending the research beyond the confines of the Pāli canon, as the Chinese *Āgamas* and *Vinayas* definitely need to be considered, together with relevant material preserved in Tibetan. Given that we do not possess archaeological or epigraphic material on the foundation of the order of nuns and thus have to rely entirely on textual records – with all the problems that this entails – it is all the more imperative that the extant textual records are used in as comprehensive a manner as possible.

In the present case, the Chinese *Āgamas* are taken into consideration by von Hinüber on one occasion,⁴⁰ when in relation to the *Dakkhināvibhaṅga-sutta* he remarks that "L. Schmithausen draws my attention to the remarkable fact that some Chinese versions correctly preserve a most likely older version of the text without any reference to the nuns" (2008: 21 note 59). This is not correct, as the two Chinese parallels to the *Dakkhināvibhaṅga-sutta* refer repeatedly to the nuns.

Von Hinüber apparently misunderstood a remark made by Schmithausen to the effect that while a particular phrase in the Pāli version speaks of a gift given to "the two communities headed by the Buddha", the corresponding phrase in the Chinese parallels speaks only of a gift given to "the community of monks headed by the Buddha", as is also the case for a Tibetan version preserved as a *sūtra* quotation in Śamathadeva's commentary on the *Abhidharmakośa*.⁴¹ The Pāli, Chinese and Tibetan versions agree, however, on mentioning gifts given to the community of nuns,⁴² or gifts to a group of nuns, etc.

Though von Hinüber is certainly right in highlighting that the canonical sources refer less frequently to nuns than one would have expected, a background for appreciating why nuns were not present when the Buddha passed away could be gathered from several *Vinaya* rules. These rules reveal that close association between monks and nuns was prone to lead to criticism and to suspicions that they might be having amorous relations. To avoid such suspicions and criticism, according to regulations recorded similarly in the different *Vinayas*, monks were not allowed to set out travelling together with nuns, or to embark with them in the same boat, in fact a monk should not even teach nuns late in the evening.⁴³ Evidently, contacts between nuns and monks were a delicate matter.

Not even the Buddha himself appears to have been above such suspicions. The Pāli *Udāna* collection reports that the female wanderer Sundarī was killed and her body buried in Jeta's Grove in order to discredit the Buddhist monks.⁴⁴ According to the commentary on the *Dhammapada*, this defamation was specifically aimed at the Buddha, insinuating that he had taken his pleasure with Sundarī, after which his disciples had killed and buried her in order to hide the misdoings of their teacher.⁴⁵ A similar tale is also found in the Chinese counterpart to the *Aṭṭhakavagga* of the *Sutta-nipāta*.⁴⁶ The commentary on the *Bāhitika-sutta* indicates that this defamation even motivated king Prasenajit to question Ānanda on the moral integrity of the Buddha, an inquiry also reported in the Chinese parallel.⁴⁷ The tale about Sundarī's murder appears to have been well known throughout generations of Buddhists, as the travel records of the Chinese pilgrims Fa-xian (法顯) and Xuan-zang (玄奘) refer to the place where she had been buried in Jeta's Grove.⁴⁸

Another tale recorded in the Pāli tradition involves a female wanderer by the name of Ciñcā-māṇavikā, who feigned being with child and accused the Buddha of being responsible for her pregnancy.⁴⁹ A similar story recurs in the (Mūla)-sarvāstivāda *Vinaya* and in the Chinese *Udāna* collection,⁵⁰ and in this case, too, Fa-xian (法顯) and Xuan-zang (玄奘) knew a version of this story.⁵¹

Independent of whatever historical value one may assign to these stories,⁵² they do reflect ancient Indian concerns about relations between celibates and the other sex. Such concerns make it only natural for the Buddha to not set out wandering in the company of nuns.

This would make it more easily understandable why the canonical sources frequently report that the Buddha addresses monks, who would

regularly have been with him on his wanderings. Due to his wandering life style, contacts with nuns would naturally have been less frequent. The same would also explain why at the time of the Buddha's passing away nuns were not present, simply because they did not accompany him on his wanderings. Thus they stood little chance of being present when he suddenly fell ill and passed away while being in the midst of one of his tours of the country.

Yet, even taking into account that relations between the Buddha and the nuns would naturally have been considerably less than with monks, the relative dearth of passages that record the Buddha directly speaking to nuns remains remarkable.

However, references to the Buddha directly speaking to nuns are not entirely absent from the four Pāli *Nikāyas*. In addition to a discourse in the *Samyutta-nikāya*, according to which the Buddha delivered a discourse on the nature of a stream-enterer to a group of one-hundred nuns,⁵³ a discourse in the *Aṅguttara-nikāya* reports how the Buddha gave a succinct instruction on the chief principles of the Dharma to Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī, when they were both at Vaiśālī.⁵⁴ This discourse is thus located at the same venue where according to the canonical account the order of nuns was founded, which suggests that she may already have been a nun. In fact, her request to be given an instruction in brief for intensive solitary practice employs a pericope used elsewhere in the Pāli discourses consistently by monastics.⁵⁵ The impression that Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī would have been a nun at the time of the delivery of this discourse is further strengthened by the circumstance that the Buddha replies to her request by recommending the development of a set of qualities, one of which is that she should be "easy to support", *subhara*, instead of being "difficult to support", *dubbhara*.⁵⁶ These qualities would refer to the relationship between a monastic and his lay supporters, in fact elsewhere in the four Pāli *Nikāyas* these terms recur in explicit relation to a monastic.⁵⁷ Thus the location, the formulation of her request and the phrasing of the Buddha's reply make it highly probable that she was already a nun at the time of this discourse.

Besides, the fewness of reports where the Buddha directly addresses nuns could be a characteristic of the Theravāda tradition in particular. Roth (1970: xl) notes that according to the description of the promulgation of rules for nuns in the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravāda *Vinaya*, Mahāprajā-

patī Gautamī regularly approaches the Buddha to personally report any case of misconduct to him. In the Theravāda *Vinaya* such cases happen only rarely,⁵⁸ as here the role of reporting a matter to the Buddha is usually taken by the monks instead, who have been informed about what has happened by the nuns. In the Dharmaguptaka, Mahīśāsaka, (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda and Sarvāstivāda *Vinayas* such meetings between Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī and the Buddha occur more regularly.⁵⁹ Thus in this respect the Theravāda *Vinaya* seems to stand out as the version that reports the least number of direct contacts between Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī and the Buddha.

The same pattern seems to also manifest in the Pāli *Nikāyas*. An example would be the *Nandakovāda-sutta*, where von Hinüber (2008: 24) rightly highlights that the Buddha, on being asked by Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī to instruct the nuns, "does not even talk to her".⁶⁰ The same is not the case in a Chinese parallel, in a Sanskrit fragment parallel, and in a *sūtra* quotation found in the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, preserved in Chinese and Tibetan. All these parallel versions agree in reporting that the Buddha personally gave teachings to Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī and to the nuns who had come together with her.⁶¹

A similar instance is the *Cūlavaddalla-sutta*, where in the Pāli version the nun Dharmadinnā does not have any direct contact with the Buddha. In the Chinese counterpart, she personally speaks to the Buddha, a circumstance also reported in a Tibetan version of this discourse preserved as a *sūtra* quotation in Śamathadeva's commentary on the *Abhidharmakośa*.⁶²

In addition to this apparent tendency in Theravāda texts of minimizing contacts between the Buddha and nuns, it also needs to be taken into account that at times references to monks in Pāli discourses may implicitly include the nuns. A case in point can be found in the *Yuganaddha-sutta*, which depicts four ways in which "monks or nuns" may reach full liberation. Even though these four ways are introduced by explicitly mentioning the nuns alongside the monks, the actual treatment of each individual way only speaks of monks, and the nuns are only mentioned again in the concluding statement.⁶³ Since the introductory and concluding statement, as well as the matter at hand, make it clear that the same four ways also apply to nuns, the usage of the term *bhikkhu* in the actual treatment clearly does not intend to restrict the exposition to monks alone, but rather acts as an umbrella term that includes the nuns as well. A parallel discourse in the *Samyukta-āgama* is more consistent in this respect, as here the nuns

are mentioned not only in the introductory and concluding statement, but also in the actual treatment of the four ways of reaching liberation.⁶⁴

A similar pattern can be observed in the case of the *Cetokhila-sutta* of the *Aṅguttara-nikāya*, where again the general statements found in the introductory and concluding sections speak of monks and nuns, whereas the actual treatment only refers to monks.⁶⁵ Since the discourse lists mental obstructions that prevent spiritual progress, here too it seems safe to presume that the treatment given is not meant to be of relevance to monks alone. Two Chinese parallels, found in the *Madhyama-āgama* and the *Ekottarika-āgama*, also mention the nuns.⁶⁶ A version of the *Cetokhila-sutta* found in the *Majjhima-nikāya*, whose exposition of these mental obstructions is in other respects similar to the *Aṅguttara-nikāya* version, does not mention the nuns at all.⁶⁷

These instances suggest that the absence of references to the Buddha directly conversing with nuns, or any lack of explicit mention made of nuns, may be characteristic of the Theravāda reciters in particular. This further highlights the methodological problem mentioned above, since restricting the range of sources to the four Pāli *Nikāyas* necessarily results in a partial picture. This can only be rectified when all available sources are taken into account.

The methodological problem of adequate examination of sources can also be demonstrated with cases like the *Nandakovāda-sutta* or the *Cūḷavedalla-sutta*, since these discourses are testimonies to contact between the Buddha and the nuns in all versions, including the Pāli accounts. It is only when the frame of examination is narrowed down to instances where the Buddha directly addresses an individual nun, that even the information provided by the Pāli discourses is lost sight of.

3) Comparison with the Jaina Tradition

Von Hinüber (2008: 24) compares his assessment of the attitude towards nuns in early Buddhism with "the very different attitude to nuns reflected in Śvetāmbara Jaina texts", where "Mahāvīra himself personally communicated with the chief nun Candaṇā". He further notes that "in contrast to Buddhism, there is neither any trace of reluctance to accept nuns nor are there separate sets of rules for monks and nuns in Śvetāmbara Jainism".

Von Hinüber's reference to a particular occasion where "Mahāvīra himself personally communicated with the chief nun Candaṇā" appears to be

based on a misreading. Von Hinüber bases himself on Schubring,⁶⁸ yet the relevant passage in Schubring only indicates that Mahāvīra brought his 'mother' Devāṇandā to Ajja Candaṇā, without mentioning any form of communication.⁶⁹ The corresponding passage in the *Viyāhapannatti*, the source text referred to by Schubring, just reports that, after having himself given the going forth to his 'mother',⁷⁰ Mahāvīra personally handed her over to Ajja Candaṇā.⁷¹ Thus this particular instance does not record any "personal communication between Mahāvīra and Candaṇā" and would fall short of fulfilling the criteria von Hinüber applies to Buddhist texts, where he only considers instances to be relevant if they record a direct communication between the Buddha and an individual nun.

Regarding contacts between Jaina nuns and Mahāvīra in general, if we are to believe the *Jinacaritra*, Mahāvīra's nun disciples more than doubled their male counterparts.⁷² Yet, the scriptures of the Jaina canon do not give nuns the prominent place one would have expected in the light of such figures, as their occurrence, or even references to them, fall far behind the ratio given in the *Jinacaritra*. Thus a perusal of Jaina texts gives the impression as if the same pattern may have been operative in Jaina and in Buddhist texts, in that the degree to which nuns occur in the respective canons probably reflects the predilection of the male reciters more than actual historical conditions.

In relation to personal contact between the nuns and Mahāvīra, it is instructive to turn to the *Antagaḍa-dasāo* (*Antakṛddaśā*), the eighth *aṅga* of the Jaina canon. This work contains a series of legends of saints, depicting their life from the time before their conversion until their final fast to death. According to Jaina customs, permission from one's teacher is required before beginning such fasting to death. In the case of monks, the *Antagaḍa-dasāo* reports that such permission was personally given by the leader of the community, Mahāvīra or Ariṣṭanemi, one of his predecessors.⁷³ But when describing such action undertaken by nuns, the last chapter of this work reports that such permission is requested from and then given by Ajja Candaṇā.⁷⁴ Thus here, too, a canonical text gives the distinct impression that the nuns did not have the same type of personal contact with the leader of the community as the monks.

Another instance of interest is the tale of a female predecessor of Mahāvīra by the name Mallī, whose story is narrated in the *Nāyādhammakahāo* (*Jñātādhammakathā*), the sixth *aṅga* of the Jaina canon. The Śvetāmbara version of this tale describes Mallī's youth as a princess and her renuncia-

tion. Roth (1983: 48) notes that during the later part of this description, beginning with the moment that she is qualified as an *arhat*, the text switches to employing masculine forms to refer to Mallī, even though she is still a woman.⁷⁵ The Digambara version of this tale, then, speaks from the outset of male Malli instead, describing 'his' youth as a prince, 'his' going forth and 'his' awakening.⁷⁶

The shift from female Mallī to male Malli reflects the view, firmly held by the Digambara Jains, that women are by nature incapable of attaining liberation.⁷⁷ According to Schubring (1962: 61), a Jaina work by the title *Chappāhuḍa* even goes so far as to conclude that, given that women cannot reach liberation, there should be no nuns at all.

Though such doubts about women's capabilities to reach liberation need not have been in circulation already at the time of Mahāvīra and the Buddha, they nevertheless stand in stark contrast to the early Buddhist attitude, where the canonical texts clearly acknowledge women's ability to attain all four stages of awakening, something mentioned explicitly in several canonical accounts of the foundation of the order of nuns.⁷⁸

Turning to the next point raised by von Hinüber, he notes that the Jaina texts do not report any "reluctance to accept nuns". Given that we do not have an account of the foundation of the Jaina order of nuns, it would be difficult to come to a conclusion regarding the presence or absence of any reluctance when the Jaina order of nuns was founded.

Regarding the formulation of rules, in the sense that according to von Hinüber there are no "separate sets of rules for monks and nuns in Śvetāmbara Jainism", it seems uncertain to what degree such formulations can be taken as indicators of an equal treatment of monks and nuns. It could just as well be assumed that the Buddhist nuns are given more importance by having rules addressed to them individually, instead of just being included in the rules formulated for monks.

Besides, according to Deo (1956: 501) the monastic regulations of the Digambara Jains tend not to mention nuns at all, leave alone treating them on a par with monks. Even in the case the Śvetāmbara Jains, the difference between their mode of presenting rules for nuns and the Buddhist monastic regulations is perhaps not as clear-cut as might seem at first sight. For example the *Vavahāra* (*Vyāvahāra*), one of the *Cheda-sūtras* of the Śvetāmbara canon and thus a text of central importance for Jaina monastic discipline, presents some rules for monks and nuns separately, in

ANĀLAYO: Theories on the Foundation of the Nun's Order

subsequent chapters of its treatment, even though the actual formulation of these rules – except for replacing masculine forms with their feminine counterparts – is the same.⁷⁹

Moreover, closer inspection brings to light rules that do not breathe a spirit of equality. Thus two rules in the *Vavahāra* stipulate that a nun can ascend to the position of *upādhyāya* after having been ordained for thirty years, while she can become an *ācārya-upādhyāya* once she has completed sixty years; in contrast, a monk needs to only have been ordained for three years to become an *upādhyāya* and after five years he can take up the position of an *ācārya-upādhyāya*.⁸⁰ This corroborates the observation by von Glasenapp (1999: 376) that in Jainism "the rules for nuns in parts are stricter than those for monks".⁸¹ Thus it seems as if Jaina nuns may not have fared substantially better in this respect than Buddhist nuns, who have to observe more rules than their male counterparts.

Jain (1947: 153) explains that Jaina nuns were not allowed to study certain texts, the reasoning being that "women are not strong enough and are fickle-minded". Such a restriction does not appear to be known from the early Buddhist traditions. According to Balbir (2002: 70), "except in recent times ... Jain women have not been able to speak for themselves: almost all the texts we have inherited from the past are written by monks or are male-oriented, and no really innovative dogmatic treatise is known to have been composed by any woman of the tradition". A contrast to this could be provided with the example of the collection of verses by Buddhist nuns, the *Therīgāthā*.⁸²

In sum, instead of a substantially better position of nuns in the Jaina tradition, compared to Buddhist nuns, the above survey suggests that ancient Indian negative attitudes towards women in general and nuns in particular had their impact on both traditions.

4) The Order of Nuns Founded after the Death of the Buddha?

Von Hinüber (2008: 27) introduces his conclusions by stating that, "taking all the evidence preserved in the texts together ... it is not easy to avoid the conclusion that the introduction of the order of nuns was indeed an event at the end of the period of early Buddhism, not too long after the death of the Buddha".

Due to restricting himself to the four Pāli *Nikāyas* and confining his evidence to instances where the Buddha speaks to individual nuns, von Hinüber's conclusions do not "take all the evidence preserved in the texts together" into account. Once a text like the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* is treated as a reliable source of historical information (about the absence of nuns on the occasion of the Buddha's decease), the same status would have to be accorded to the range of other discourses that document the existence of the order of nuns during the Buddha's life time.⁸³

Though this methodological shortcoming already suffices to vitiate the proposed theory, it may nevertheless be worthwhile to follow up the implications of von Hinüber's proposal. On the assumption that the Buddha did not found an order of nuns, it is difficult to conceive of anyone who could have started an order of nuns once the Buddha had passed away, just as it is hard to imagine how anyone could successfully have carried out such a revolutionary action as founding an order of nuns on his or her own.

Regarding the 'how' of such an innovation, since tradition attributes the origin of all *Vinaya* related actions to the Buddha, an innovation of such magnitude, without having a precedent in a permission or legislation by the Buddha, would have faced insurmountable obstacles as long as the early generations of disciples, especially his faithful attendant Ānanda, were still alive. Their regard for their deceased teacher would have been too strong to allow them to embark on something they knew the Buddha had consistently opposed. The accounts of the so-called first council clearly reflect a move towards traditionalism – expressed in the narration that the rules, whose abolishing the Buddha had sanctioned, were not abandoned – making an innovation of such a magnitude a highly improbable event.⁸⁴

Even to put such a move into operation in later times would have been exceedingly difficult, and the greater the time distance from the Buddha's lifetime becomes, the more difficult it would be to successfully canonize such an act in the orally transmitted texts of different Buddhist schools.

Von Hinüber (2008: 25) assumes that "the Buddhists ... had to give in to some sort of social pressure from outside ... and were forced ... to establish an order of nuns". He gives no reference for this suggestion, in fact it would be difficult to provide support for the notion of a social pressure in ancient India in favour of establishing an order of nuns.

ANĀLAYO: Theories on the Foundation of the Nun's Order

Given that the *Vinayas* portray the Buddha as someone willing to lend an ear to general opinion, had such social pressure been in existence during his life time, it would run counter to his character portrayal in the canonical sources to assume that he did not lend an ear to it. If, however, we assume that such social pressure came into being only afterwards, then the supposed foundation of the order of nuns would have to be placed at a considerable temporal distance from the Buddha's life time in order for such social pressure to come into existence and build up to a level sufficiently strong to exert its influence.

Besides, the assumption of a social pressure in favour of founding an order of nuns after the Buddha's life time does not fit too well with the little we know about the ancient Indian situation. While several texts point to some degree of spiritual freedom for women during Vedic and early Upaniṣadic times,⁸⁵ their position seems to suffer a gradual decline until it reaches an absolute low with the *Manusmṛti*. Thus the further we advance in time, the less one would expect public opinion to be in favour of establishing an order of nuns. This, too, makes it highly improbable that any faction in the Buddhist community would have been motivated to undertake such an innovation, let alone have been able to carry it through.

Regarding the 'who' of such an innovation, tradition unanimously presents Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī as the foster mother of the Buddha. This implies that she would have been considerably older than him, in fact several texts report that she passed away before the Buddha.⁸⁶ Had she still been alive, then by the time of the Buddha's passing away she would have been a centenarian at least, making her an improbable candidate for starting an order of nuns at a still later time. Yet, this seems to be what von Hinüber (2008: 20) has in mind. After noting that when Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī approaches the Buddha at Vaiśālī, "Gotamī and all the Sākiyānīs look like a group of female ascetics with their leader", he suggests that "the particular vocabulary in the rules for nuns can be explained easily as remnants of the peculiar linguistic usage of these female ascetics in their own rules at the time before they converted to Buddhism". Von Hinüber (2008: 21) continues by referring to this "group of female ascetics joining Buddhism", concluding that "the *saṃgha* of nuns is created by accepting the whole group of ascetics accompanying Mahāprajāpatī Gotamī."

Thus here Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī and her following of Śākyan ladies, because a canonical passage describes them as resembling female ascetics, are turned into actual female ascetics that have gone forth under a non-

Buddhist teacher, who would have taught them the vocabulary that they are going to introduce into the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga*.

To draw out the implication of this hypothesis: after her initial request to be allowed to become a Buddhist nun has met with the Buddha's refusal, Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī – who as a stream-enterer would have been unable to follow a non-Buddhist teacher⁸⁷ – goes forth as a nun under a non-Buddhist ascetic, together with her following of Śākya ladies. Once the Buddha has passed away, Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī manages to transform herself and her following of female ascetics into Buddhist nuns, which earlier was not possible because of the Buddha's refusal. Nobody is able to stop them from doing something that everyone knew had not been sanctioned by the Buddha. Those sympathetic with her action devise a canonical account of the foundation of the nuns' order that attributes this innovation to the Buddha himself, an account that is then successfully inserted in the *Vinayas* and other canonical scriptures of the different Buddhist school. The only trace left of this amazing feat is the occurrence of the terms *vuṭṭhāpeti* and *pavattinī* in the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga*, originating from the non-Buddhist rules that Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī and her followers had been observing during their intermezzo as non-Buddhist ascetics.

This hypothesis thus involves the assumptions that:

- a) the Buddha remained firm in his refusal to found an order of nuns;
- b) Buddhist women who wanted to go forth thereon decided to do so under a non-Buddhist teacher;
- c) social pressure was in favour of having an order of nuns among Buddhists;
- d) at some time after the Buddha had passed away, these non-Buddhist female ascetics decided to transform themselves into Buddhist nuns;
- e) nobody managed to prevent this creation of a Buddhist order of nuns that had not been sanctioned by the already deceased teacher;
- f) a fictional account of the Buddha founding an order of nuns was created and inserted in the different *Vinayas* and other canonical scriptures;
- g) the canonical texts of all Buddhist schools were successfully amended to fit this account by inserting reports of meetings between nuns and the Buddha, the Buddha referring to nuns etc.;

h) the composers of the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga* were influenced in their choice of words by the terminology that these non-Buddhist female ascetics – who by now had become Buddhist nuns – had learned from their former teachers or companions.

In an earlier part of his paper, von Hinüber (2008: 7) describes a "golden rule that, if two assumptions are needed to remove one difficulty, chances are extremely high that the suggested explanation is wrong: On the contrary, one assumption should solve at least two problems". Applying this criterion to his own hypothesis, the number of assumptions required indicates that "chances are extremely high that the suggested explanation is wrong". Besides requiring too many assumptions, this hypothesis conflicts with nearly "all the evidence preserved in the texts together". The textual evidence at our disposition clearly implies that Buddhist nuns were in existence at the Buddha's time.

This hypothesis thus fares similarly to the suggestion that the account of the foundation of the nuns' order was devised only after the division between the Sthavira and the Mahāsāṃghika schools; the assumption that an alternative account can be found in the *Māitrisimit*; and the conjecture that nuns may already have been in existence before Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī went forth. None of these theories has been able to develop a convincing perspective on how the order of nuns came into existence.

The coming into being of these different explanatory attempts, however, serves an important function, in that it highlights the problematic nature of the canonical account of the foundation of the order of nuns, which is difficult to reconcile with the way other canonical texts portray the Buddha's attitude towards the nuns.⁸⁸ Up to now, this canonical account remains an enigma awaiting a credible solution.

Examining the hypotheses developed so far clearly indicates that any attempt at solving this enigma needs to be based on a comprehensive survey of the relevant textual material, as not taking into account some relevant source(s) seems to be the central factor undermining the conclusions arrived at in the case of each of the four theories reviewed above.⁸⁹

Another point worth pondering is how far even a comprehensive survey of the textual sources at our disposition can be expected to yield a reliable reconstruction of historical facts and events. Perhaps a more fruitful approach would be to just let the texts speak for themselves,⁹⁰ instead of trying to cut them to size so that they fit the mould of a particular hypothe-

JCBSSL VOL. VI

sis. We might content ourselves to give a fair hearing to the "multiplicity of voices" that Sponberg (1992: 3) sees pervading early Buddhist discourse on women in general and nuns in particular. If allowed to unfold without being silenced by our preconceived notions, this multiplicity of voices could tell us a lot about the texts themselves, and about those who transmitted them.

ANĀLAYO: Theories on the Foundation of the Nun's Order

ABBREVIATIONS

Ap	<i>Apadāna</i>
AN	<i>Aṅguttara-nikāya</i>
B ^e	Burmese edition
D	Derge edition
Dhp-a	<i>Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā</i>
EĀ	<i>Ekottarika-āgama</i> (T 125)
Jā	<i>Jātaka</i>
MĀ	<i>Madhyama-āgama</i> (T 26)
MN	<i>Majjhima-nikāya</i>
Mp	<i>Manorathapūraṇī</i>
Pj	<i>Paramatthajotikā</i>
Ps	<i>Papañcasūdanī</i>
Q	Peking edition
SĀ	<i>Saṃyukta-āgama</i> (T 99)
SĀ ²	'other' <i>Saṃyukta-āgama</i> (T 100)
S ^e	Siamese edition
SHT	Sanskrihandschriften aus den Turfanfunden
SN	<i>Saṃyutta-nikāya</i>
Sn	<i>Sutta-nipāta</i>
Sp	<i>Samantapāsādikā</i>
T	Taishō
Th	<i>Theragāthā</i>
Thī	<i>Therīgāthā</i>
Ud	<i>Udāna</i>
Vin	<i>Vinaya</i>

REFERENCES

- Adams, Douglas A. 1999: *A Dictionary of Tocharian B*, Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Anālayo 2005: "Some Pāli Discourses in the Light of Their Chinese Parallels (2)", *Buddhist Studies Review*, vol. 22 no. 2 pp. 93-105.
- Anālayo 2009: "Women's Renunciation in Early Buddhism – The Four Assemblies and the Foundation of the Order of Nuns", in *Proceedings of the Congress on the Bhikṣuṇī Ordination*, T. Mohr (ed.), Wisdom Publications (forthcoming).
- An, Yan-Gyu 2001: "The Date and Origin of the *Mahāparinibbāna-suttanta*", *Buddhist Studies (Bukkyō Kenkyū)*, vol. 30 pp. 45-79.
- Balbir 2002: "Women and Jainism in India", in *Women in Indian Religions*, A. Sharma (ed.), Delhi: Oxford University Press, pp. 70-107.
- Banerjee, Anukul Chandra 1977: *Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts in Sanskrit, Prātimokṣa Sūtra and Bhikṣukarmavākya*, Calcutta: World Press.
- Bapat, P.V. 1945/part 1, 1950/part 2: "The Arthapada-Sūtra Spoken by the Buddha", *Visva-Bharati Annals*, vol. 1 pp. 135-227 and vol. 3 pp. 1-109.
- Bareau, André 1979: "La Composition et les Étapes de la Formation Progressive du Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra Ancien", *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient*, vol. 66 pp. 45-103.
- Barnett 1973: *The Antagaḍa-dasāo and Aṅuttarovavāyīya-dasāo*, Varanasi: Prthivi Prakashan.
- Basham, A. L. 1954: *The Wonder that was India, A Survey of the Culture of the Indian sub-continent before the coming of the Muslims*, London: Sidgwick and Jackson; page references are to the reprint 1999, Delhi: Rupa & Co.
- Bechert, Heinz 1989: *Sanskrihandschriften aus den Turfanfunden, Teil 6*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Blackstone, Kathryn R. 1998: *Women in the Footsteps of the Buddha, Struggle for Liberation in the Therīgāthā*, Richmond: Curzon; page references are to the reprint 2000, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Blackstone, Kathryn 1999: "Damming the Dhamma: Problems with Bhikkhūnīs in the Pāli Vinaya", *Journal of Buddhist Ethics*, vol. 6 pp. 292-312.
- Chung, Jin-Il 1998: "'Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavācanā' of the Mūlasarvāstivādins", in *Facets of Indian Culture, Gustav Roth Felicitation Volume, Published on the Occasion of his 82nd Birthday*, C.P. Sinha (ed.), India, Patna: Bihar Puravid Parishad, pp. 420-423.
- Clauson, Sir Gerard 1972: *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Deeg, Max 2005: *Das Gaoseng-Faxian-Zhuan als religionsgeschichtliche Quelle, Der älteste Bericht eines chinesischen buddhistischen Pilgermönchs über seine Reise nach Indien mit Übersetzung des Textes*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Deo, Shantaram Balchandra 1956: *History of Jaina Monachism, From Inscriptions and Literature*, Poona: Deccan College.
- Doshi, Pt. Becharadas J. 1974: *Viyāhapaṇṇatisuttaṃ*, Bombay: Shri Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya.

ANĀLAYO: Theories on the Foundation of the Nun's Order

- Dutt, Nalinaksha 1984: *Gilgit Manuscripts, Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinayavastu, vol. III part 1*, Delhi: Sri Satguru.
- Dutt, Sukumar 1957: *The Buddha and five after-centuries*, London: Luzac.
- Edgerton, Franklin 1953: *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, New Haven: Yale University Press; page references are to the reprint 1998, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, vol. 2.
- Eimer, H. 1976: *Skizzen des Erlösungsweges in buddhistischen Begriffsreihen*, Bonn: Religionswissenschaftliches Seminar der Universität Bonn.
- Enomoto, Fumio 1984: "The Formation and Development of the Sarvāstivāda Scriptures", in *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Congress of Human Sciences in Asia and North Africa*, Y. Tatsuuro (ed.), Tokyo: Tōhō Gakkai, pp. 197-198.
- Feer, Léon 1897: "Ciñca-Mānavikā Sundarī", *Journal Asiatique*, Ser. 3 vol. 9 pp. 288-317.
- Findly, Ellison Banks 1985: "Gārgī at the King's Court: Women and Philosophical Innovation in Ancient India", in *Women, Religion and Social Change*, I.Y. Haddad et al. (ed.), New York: State University of New York Press, pp. 37-58.
- Frauwallner, Erich 1956: *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature*, Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- Geng, Shimin et al. 1988: *Das Zusammentreffen mit Maitreya, Die ersten fünf Kapitel der Hani-Version der Maitrisimit*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Gethin, Rupert 2006: "Mythology as Meditation: From the Mahāśudassana Sutta to the Sukhāvativyūha Sūtra", *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, vol. 28 pp. 63-112.
- Gyatso, Janet 2003: "One Plus One Makes Three: Buddhist Gender, Monasticism, and the Law of the Non-excluded Middle", *History of Religions*, vol. 43 no. 2 pp. 89-115.
- Harvey, Peter 1990: *An Introduction to Buddhism, Teachings, history and practices*, Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- Harvey, Peter 2000: *An Introduction to Buddhist Ethics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heirman, Ann 1997: "Some Remarks on the Rise of the bhikṣuṇīsaṃgha and on the Ordination Ceremony for bhikṣuṇīs according to the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya", *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, vol. 20 no. 2 pp. 33-85.
- Heirman, Ann 2001: "Chinese Nuns and their Ordination in Fifth Century China", *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, vol. 24 no. 2 pp. 275-304.
- Heirman, Ann 2008: "Where is the Probationer in the Chinese Buddhist Nunneries?", *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. 158 no. 1 pp. 105-137.
- Hirakawa, Akira 1982: *Monastic Discipline for the Buddhist Nuns: An English Translation of the Chinese Text of the Mahāsāṃghika-Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*, Patna: Jayaswal Research Institute.

JCBSSL VOL. VI

- Horner, I.B. 1930: *Women under Primitive Buddhism, Laywomen and Almswomen*, London: Routledge; page references are to the reprint 1990, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Hüsken, Ute 1997: *Die Vorschriften für die Buddhistischen Nonnengemeinde im Vinaya-Piṭaka der Theravādin*, Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.
- Hüsken, Ute 2000: "The Legend of the Establishment of the Buddhist Order of Nuns in the Theravāda Vinaya-Piṭaka", *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, vol. 26 pp. 43-69.
- Jacobi, Hermann 1897: *The Kalpasūtra of Bhadrabāhu*, Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- Jain, Jagdish Chandra 1947: *Life in Ancient India as Depicted in the Jain Canons*, Bombay: New Book Company.
- Jaini, Padmanabh S. 1991: *Gender and Salvation, Jaina Debates on the Spiritual Liberation of Women*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kabilsingh, Chatsumarn 1984: *A Comparative Study of the Bhikkhunī Pāṭimokkha*, Delhi: Chaukhambha Orientalia.
- Lamotte, Étienne 1944: *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra)*, Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut Orientaliste; page references are to the reprint 1981, vol. 1.
- Lamotte, Étienne 1958: *Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien, Des Origines à L'Ère Śaka*, Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut Orientaliste.
- Laut, Jens Peter 1991: "Die Gründung des buddhistischen Nonnenordens in der alt-türkischen Überlieferung", in *Türkische Sprachen und Literaturen: Materialien der ersten deutschen Turkologen-Konferenz*, I. Baldauf (ed.), Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, pp. 257-274.
- Lindquist, Steven E. 2008: "Gender at Janaka's Court: Women in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad Reconsidered", *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, vol. 36 pp. 405-426.
- Lü, Cheng 1963: "Āgama", in *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, G.P. Malalasekera (ed.), Sri Lanka: Department of Buddhist Affairs, vol. 1 no. 2 pp. 241-244.
- Mayeda [=Maeda], Egaku 1985: "Japanese Studies on the Schools of the Chinese Āgamas", in *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur, Erster Teil*, H. Bechert (ed.), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, vol. 1 pp. 94-103.
- Minh Chau, Thich 1991: *The Chinese Madhyama Āgama and the Pāli Majjhima Nikāya*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Modi, M.C. 1932: *The Antagaḍa-dasāo and the Aṅuttaravavāia-dasāo, the eighth and the ninth Aṅgas of the Jain Canon*, Ahmedabad: Shumbhulal Jagshi Shah.
- Ñānamoli Bhikkhu 1995: *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha, A Translation of the Majjhima Nikāya*, Bhikku Bodhi (ed.), Boston: Wisdom; page references are to the reprint 2005.
- Nattier, Jan 1991: *Once Upon a Future Time: Studies in a Buddhist Prophecy of Decline*, Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press.
- Nattier, Jan 2003: *A Few Good Men: The Bodhisattva Path according to The Inquiry of Ugra (Ugraparipṛcchā)*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

ANĀLAYO: Theories on the Foundation of the Nun's Order

- Nattier, Jan 2004: "Decline", in *Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, R.E. Buswell (ed.), New York: Macmillan, vol. 1 pp. 210-213.
- Nolot, Édith 1991: *Règles de Discipline des Nonnes Bouddhistes, Le Bhikṣuṇīvinaya de l'École Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin*, Paris: Boccard.
- Norman, K.R. 1983: *Pāli Literature, Including the Canonical Literature in Prakrit and Sanskrit of all the Hīnayāna Schools of Buddhism*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Norman, K.R. 1992: *The Group of Discourses (Sutta-nipāta), Volume II*, Oxford: Pali Text Society.
- Norman, K.R. 2001: "Vutṭhāpeti, vuṭṭhāna and related matter", *Indologica Taurinensia*, vol. 27 pp. 121-137.
- Pachow, W. 1945/1946: "Comparative Studies in the Mahāparinibbāna-sutta and its Chinese Versions", *Sino-Indian Studies*, vol. 1 part 4 pp. 167-210; vol. 2 part 1 pp. 1-41.
- Pande, Govind Chandra 1957: *Studies in the Origins of Buddhism*, University of Allahabad, Department of Ancient History.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean 1991: "Un témoignage tokharien sur les premières nonnes bouddhistes", *Bulletin d'Études Indiennes*, vol. 9 pp. 161-194.
- Przyluski, Jean 1918-1920: "Le Parinirvāna et le Funerailles du Buddha", *Journal Asiatique*, ser. 11 vol. 11 pp. 485-526, vol. 12 pp. 401-456, vol. 13 pp. 365-430, vol. 15 pp. 5-54.
- Rhys Davids, T.W. 1910: *Dialogues of the Buddha, Translated from the Pāli of the Dīgha Nikāya*, London: Oxford University Press, vol. 2.
- Ridding, C.M. et al. 1919: "A Fragment of the Sanskrit Vinaya: Bhikṣuṇīkarmavācānā", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, vol. 1 no. 3 pp. 123-143.
- Roth, Gustav 1970: *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya, Including Bhikṣuṇī-Prakīrṇaka and a Summary of the Bhikṣu-Prakīrṇaka of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin*, Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute.
- Roth, Gustav 1983: *Mallī-jñāta, Das achte Kapitel des Nāyādhammakahāo im sechsten Aṅga des Śvetāmbara Jainakanons, Herausgegeben, übersetzt und erläutert*, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Schmidt, Michael 1993: "Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavācānā, Die Handschrift Sansk. c.25(R) der Bodleian Library Oxford", in *Studien zur Indologie und Buddhismuskunde, Festgabe des Seminars für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde für Professor Dr. Heinz Bechert zum 60. Geburtstag am 26. Juni 1992*, M. Hahn (ed.), Bonn: Indica et Tibetica, pp. 239-288.
- Schmidt, Michael 1994: "Zur Schulzugehörigkeit einer nepalesischen Handschrift der Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavācānā", in *Untersuchungen zur Buddhistischen Literatur*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 155-164.
- Schmidt, Klaus T. 1996: "Das tocharische Maitreyasamitināṭaka im Vergleich mit der uigurischen Maitrisimit", in *Turfan, Khotan und Dunhuang*, R.E. Emmerick et al. (ed.), Berlin: Akademie Verlag, pp. 269-278.
- Schubring, Walther 1918: *Vavahāra- und Nisīhasutta, (Abhandlungen für die Kunde der Morgenlandes XV, I)*, Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus.

JCBSSL VOL. VI

- Schubring, Walther 1935: *Die Lehre der Jainas, nach den alten Quellen dargestellt*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Schubring, Walther 1962: *The Doctrine of the Jainas, Described after the Old Sources*, W. Beurlen (trsl.), Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass; page references are to the reprint 2000.
- Schumann, W. Hans 1999: *Der historische Buddha, Leben und Lehre des Gotama*, München: Diederichs.
- Shāntā, N. 1997: *The Unknown Pilgrims, The Voice of the Sādhis: The history, spirituality and life of the Jaina women ascetics*, trsl. M. Rogers, Delhi: Sri Satguru; orig. publ. 1985 *La voie jaina: histoire, spiritualité, vie des ascète pèlerines de l'Inde*, Paris: O.E.I.L.
- Shih, Bhikkhunī Juo-Hsüeh 2000: *Controversies over Buddhist Nuns*, Oxford: Pali Text Society.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2003: "Cui bono? or Follow the Money, Identifying the Sophist in a Pāli Commentary", in *Buddhist and Indian Studies in Honour of Professor Sodo Mori*, Hamamatsu (Japan): Kokusai Bukkyoto Kyokai, pp. 129-183.
- Snellgrove, David L. 1973: "Śākyamuni's Final Nirvāṇa", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, vol. 36 pp. 399-411.
- Sponberg, Alan 1992: "Attitudes toward Women and the Feminine in Early Buddhism", in *Buddhism, Sexuality and Gender*, J. Cabezon (ed.), Delhi: Sri Satguru, pp. 3-36.
- Tatia, Nathmal 1975: *Prātimokṣasūtram of the Lokottaravādamahāsāṅghika School*, Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.
- Tekin, Şinasi 1980: *Maitrisimit nom bitig, Die uigurische Übersetzung eines Werkes der buddhistischen Vaibhāṣika-Schule*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Tieken, Herman 2001: "The Arrangement of the second śrutaskandha of the Āyāraṃga", *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, vol. 29 pp. 575-588.
- Tsai, Kathryn Ann 1994: *Lives of the Nuns, Biographies of Chinese Buddhist Nuns from the Fourth to Sixth Centuries, A Translation of the Pi-ch'iu-ni chuan, compiled by Shih Pao-ch'ang*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Tsukamoto, Zenryū 1985: *A History of Early Chinese Buddhism, From its Introduction to the Death of Hui-yüan*, L. Hurwitz (trsl.), Tokyo: Kodansha International.
- von Gabain, A. 1950: *Altürkische Grammatik, mit Bibliographie, Lesestücken und Wörterverzeichnis, auch Neutürkisch*, Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz.
- von Glasenapp, Helmuth 1999: *Jainism, An Indian Religion of Salvation*, S. B. Shrotri (trsl.), Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass; orig. publ. 1925 *Der Jainismus, Eine indische Erlösungsreligion*, Berlin: A. Häger.
- von Hinüber, Oskar 1992: *Sprachentwicklung und Kulturgeschichte, Ein Beitrag zur materiellen Kultur des buddhistischen Klosterlebens, Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jahrgang 1992 Nr. 6*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- von Hinüber, Oskar 1999: *Das Pātimokkhasutta der Theravādin, Seine Gestalt und seine Entstehungsgeschichte, Studien zur Literatur des Theravāda-Buddhismus II, Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der*

ANĀLAYO: Theories on the Foundation of the Nun's Order

- geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jahrgang 1999 Nr. 6, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.*
- von Hinüber, Oskar 2008: "The Foundation of the Bhikkhunīsaṅgha – A Contribution to the Earliest History of Buddhism", *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2007*, vol. 11 pp. 3-29.
- von Simson, Georg 2000: *Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins Teil II, Kritische Textausgabe, Übersetzung, Wortindex sowie Nachträge zu Teil I*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst 1939: "Beiträge zur Textgeschichte des Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra", *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse*, pp. 55-94.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst 1944 and 1948: *Die Überlieferung vom Lebensende des Buddha, Eine vergleichende Analyse des Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra und seiner Textentsprechungen*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2 vols.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst et al. 1971: *Sanskrihandschriften aus den Turfanfunden, Teil 3*, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst 1980: "Central Asian Sūtra Fragments and their Relation to the Chinese Āgamas", in *The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition*, H. Bechert (ed.), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 136-174.
- Williams, Raymond B. 1970: "Historical Criticism of a Buddhist Scripture: The Mahāparinibbāna Sutta", *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, vol. 38 no. 2 pp. 156-167.
- Williams, Liz 2000: "A Whisper in the Silence: Nuns before Mahāpajāpatī?", *Buddhist Studies Review*, vol. 17 no. 2 pp. 167-173.
- Winternitz, Moriz 1920: *Geschichte der Indischen Literatur, Band 2, Die Buddhistische Literatur und die Heiligen Texte der Jainas*, Leipzig: Amelang; page references are to the reprint 1968, Stuttgart: K.F. Koehler.
- Xianlin, Ji 1998: *Fragments of the Tocharian A Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka of the Xinjian Museum, China*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Yin-shun 1962: 原始佛教聖典之集成 [The Compilation of the Early Buddhist Canon], Taipei: 正聞出版社, page references are to the reprint 1983.

Acknowledgement: I am indebted to Bhikkhu Bodhi, Bhikṣuṇī Jampa Tsedroen, Bhikkhunī Tathālokā and Dhammadinnā for comments on an earlier draft of this article.

NOTES

¹ Vin II 253,1 and AN 8.51 at AN IV 274,1.

² The Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya*, T 1428 at T XXII 923c9 reads: 若女人不於佛法出家者, 佛法當得久住五百歲, where the intended meaning seems to be that the Buddha's teaching would have lasted five-hundred years longer if women had not gone forth in the Buddha's teaching (in addition to the five-hundred years it will last once women have been allowed to go forth). The 'Haimavata' *Vinaya* (provided the school identification by Lamotte (1958: 212) is correct), the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya* and the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya* take the same position in different terms, as according to them due to an order of nuns coming into being the duration of the true Dharma will suffer a decrease by five hundred years (to be subtracted from the thousand years it would have lasted otherwise), T 1463 at T XXIV 803b16: 汝今為女人求出家, 後當減吾五百歲正法, (adopting the 宋, 元 and 明 variant 歲 instead of 世); T 1421 at T XXII 186a13: 若不聽女人出家受具足戒, 佛之正法住世千歲, 今聽出家則減五百年; and T 1451 at T XXIV 352a21: 若其女人不出家者, 我之教法滿一千年 ... 由出家故減五百年. A Sanskrit fragment in Schmidt 1993: 243,29 (or Ridding 1919: 125,16), which Schmidt 1994 identifies as belonging to the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya* (cf. also Chung 1998: 420 and Roth 1970: 5 note 3b), does not specify the time period, only indicating that the Dharma will not endure for a long time. The (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya* preserved in Tibetan mentions that the Buddha's teachings will no longer remain unimpaired for one-thousand years, without, however, referring to five-hundred years, *Q dul ba phran tshogs kyi gzhi, ne* 116b5 (D *da* 121a6): *bud med rnams legs par bshad pa'i chos kyi* (D: omits *kyi*) *'dul ba la rab tu ma byung na ni da yang* (D: *dung*) *nga'i bstan pa lo stong tshang bar nyes pa med cing nyams pa med par gnas par 'gyur ro*.

³ MĀ 116 at T I 607b8 indicates that if women had not been allowed to go forth, the true Dharma would have lasted a thousand years, but now its duration has decreased by five-hundred years, so that it will remain for five-hundred years only, 若女人不得於此正法律中, 至信, 捨家, 無家, 學道者, 正法當住千年, 今失五百歲, 餘有五百年.

⁴ Cf. e.g. Enomoto (1984); Lü (1963: 242); Mayeda (1985: 98); Minh Chau (1991: 27); Waldschmidt (1980: 136) and Yin-shun (1962: 703).

⁵ Cf. e.g. T 60 at T I 857c29; T 156 at T III 153c25; T 196 at T IV 159b8; and T 1478 at T XXIV 949b12.

⁶ Fa-xian's finding of this *Vinaya* is reported in T 2085 at T LI 864b19.

⁷ In a more recent publication, Nattier (2004: 210) seems to still take the same position, as she writes that the prediction "that Buddhism will endure for only five hundred years ... [is] found in the *Vinaya* texts of several different ordination lineages (*nikāya*) ... dating from perhaps a century or so after the Buddha's death". I am not sure if I fully understand the remark in Gyatso (2003: 91 note 2) that in a personal communication "Nattier maintains that the Mahāsāṃghika version of the story is garbled, suggesting it is a later interpolation". Later interpolations can probably be found in all extant accounts of the foundation of the nuns' order, but for the present purposes it seems to me that, given that in some form this prediction appears to be a common property of the Buddhist schools, it would not be a product of the Sthavira traditions only.

⁸ T 1425 at T XXII 471a25: 爾時大愛道瞿曇彌, 與五百釋女求佛出家, 如經中廣說 (adopting the 聖 variant 經, instead of 線); cf. also the translation in Hirakawa 1982: 47; and T XXII 514b4: 如大愛道出家線經中廣說. Another passage in the same *Vinaya* briefly

ANĀLAYO: Theories on the Foundation of the Nun's Order

reports that the Buddha repeatedly refused to permit women to go forth, T 1425 at T XXII 492a22: 世尊乃至三制不聽度女人出家.

⁹ Roth (1970: 16,14): *pañcāpi me varṣaśatāni saddharmo sthāsyati*; cf. also Nolot (1991: 9); a passage already noted by Blackstone (1998: 161 note 6), cf. also Blackstone (1999: 304 note 2), and Heirman (2001: 281 note 41) as conflicting with Nattier's suggestion. Nattier (1991: 32) in fact cautions that her proposal is "to some extent an argument from silence". Given that she evidently was not aware of the edition by Roth, it is quite understandable that she felt the absence of a full account in the Chinese translation of the Mahāsāṃghika *Vinaya* to be significant.

¹⁰ Laut (1991: 266) reports that "Gautamī dem Buddha ein selbsthergestelltes Gewand überreichen möchte. Dies solle aus Dankbarkeit darüber geschehen, daß er den Frauen die Gründung eines eigenen Ordens ermöglicht habe".

¹¹ Geng (1988: 170-209), paralleling MN 142 at MN III 253; MĀ 180 at T I 721c; T 84 at T I 903b and Q *mngon pa, tu* 289a (D *ju* 253b).

¹² This is implicit in the reference in MN 142 at MN III 253,29 to her firm faith, *aveccappasāda*, in regard to Buddha, *Dhamma* and *Saṅgha*, and to her having become free from doubt in regard to the four noble truths; points also made in MĀ 180 at T I 722a12: 不疑三尊, 苦習滅道 and T 84 at T I 903c21, which adds that she had thereby forever left behind doubt and views: 佛無疑, 及法僧伽亦無疑惑, 乃至苦集滅道四聖諦理, 永斷疑見; Q *mngon pa, tu* 290a4 (D *ju* 254b4) indicates that she was free from doubt in regard to Buddha, *Dhamma* and *Saṅgha*, and in regard to the four noble truths: *sangs rgyas dang chos dang dge 'dun la the tshom dang yid gnyis dang bral, sdug bsngal dang, kun 'byung dang, 'gog pa dang lam la the tshom dang yid gnyis dang bral*.

¹³ Laut (1991: 266 note 55) comments that "im Atü. wird nicht expressis verbis von einer 'Gründung des Nonnenorden' gesprochen. Inhaltliche und terminologische Kriterien weisen jedoch eindeutig darauf hin, daß unser Passus eine Reminiszenz an ebendieses Ereignis ist. So ist eine buddh. 'Ordination' (skr. *upasaṃpadā*) die Voraussetzung für die Worte der Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī: ... 'ich habe mit vielen Śākya-Frauen die Śrotāpanna-Würde erlangt". Influenced by Laut, Pinault (1991: 181) then comes to similar conclusions in regard to the Tocharian version of the *Maitrisimit* passage. Taking a lead from Pinault, Schmidt 1996: 276 then also considers this text to offer an account of the foundation of the nuns' order. The need for a closer examination of Laut's conclusion was already noted by Hüsken (2000: 46 note 9), who remarked 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 ... evidently assumes", wherefore "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".

¹⁴ Laut (1991: 266 note 55) explains that "Als 'Śrotāpanna' wird ein Mensch bezeichnet, der die unterste Stufe der buddh. monastischen Heilskarriere erklommen hat; vgl. EIMER, *Skizzen*, 67ff". Again *ibid.* p. 268: "zum Schluß der Episode predigt der Buddha den Frauen die Lehre, woraufhin alle 180.000 Śākya-Frauen die Śrotāpanna-Würde erlangen, d.h. den untersten Grad der buddh. monastischen Heilskarriere erlangen". The passage in Eimer (1976: 68), to which Laut refers, translates the standard description according to which a *bhikkhu* becomes a stream-enterer by destroying the three lower fetters. Laut apparently took this formulation to imply that only monastics can become stream-enterers.

¹⁵ The standard description of the community of noble ones speaks of the "four pairs of persons, the eight individuals" (comprising those who have reached any of the four levels

of awakening and those who are on the path to each respective level), found e.g. in MN 7 at MN I 37,25: *cattāri purisayugāni aṭṭha purisapuggalā* (S^c reads *parisapuggalā*), mentioned similarly in its parallel EĀ 13.5 at T II 574b6: 四雙八輩.

¹⁶ E.g. in MN 56 at MN I 378,35: *esāhaṃ bhante Bhagavantam saraṇaṃ gacchāmi dhammaṃ ca bhikkhusaṅghaṃ ca*, with a similarly worded counterpart in its parallel MĀ 133 at T I 630a22: 我今自歸於佛, 法及比丘眾.

¹⁷ Vin II 157,2; SĀ 592 at T II 158b6 and T 1450 at T XXIV 139b5.

¹⁸ MN 143 at MN III 262,1; SĀ 593 at T II 158b25; SĀ² 187 at T II 441c12 and EĀ 51.8 at T II 820a15.

¹⁹ MN 73 at MN I 490,34; SĀ 964 at T II 246c18 and SĀ² 198 at T II 446b17.

²⁰ Vin I 17,3; T 189 at T III 645b11; T 190 at T III 818c15; T 191 at T III 955a16; T 1421 at T XXII 105b28 and T 1450 at T XXIV 129b8. It needs to be noted, however, that the listing of accomplished householders in AN 6.119-120 at AN III 450-451 does not refer to *arahaṅts* – as seems to be assumed by Harvey (1990: 218) and Schumann (1999: 217) – as the description given of these householders only implies that they had reached some level of awakening, not necessarily the highest one. In fact AN 6.44 at AN III 348,3+5 reports that Pūraṇa and Isidatta, two householders in the listing in AN 6.120, both passed away as once-returners.

²¹ Gautamī is qualified as *qatun* throughout the description of her attempt to give the robe to the Buddha, cf. e.g. Geng (1988: 192) (2548), translated in *ibid.* p. 193,20 and elsewhere as "Königin" (except for an occurrence of *qatun* in *ibid.* p. 198 (2623), rendered p. 199,5 as "Frau"). Von Gabain (1950: 309) s.v. *qatun* gives "Gattin, Königin"; and the index in Tekin (1980: 96), s.v. *q'twn*, gives "Fürstin, Frau (hohen Ranges ...)", with *ibid.* p. 70,2 translating the term as "Frau". Clauson (1972: 602) explains that "'the wife of the lord, ruler' ... is precisely the meaning of *xatu:n* in the early period". In the Tocharian version, Gautamī is qualified as *lānts/lāts*, cf. e.g. YQ 1.25 1/2 [recto] a8 in Xianlin (1998: 168), translated in *ibid.* p. 169,18 (and elsewhere) as "queen". For Tocharian B, Adams (1999: 548), s.v. *lāntsa*, gives "queen".

²² T 84 at T I 903c22: 摩訶波闍波提苾芻尼.

²³ The idea that Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī may not have been the first nun was already advanced by Horner (1930: 102), based on the circumstance that in the *Apadāna* Yaśodharā is depicted as heading a substantial congregation of nuns, cf. Ap 30.1 at Ap 592,8. The *Apadāna* verses themselves, however, do not seem to be related to the foundation of the nuns' order and thus offer little support for Horner's hypothesis.

²⁴ Harvey (2000: 386) similarly comments that "the conflict may arise from *M.* III.253-5 consisting of two originally separate passages being put together in one text". Yet another explanation is suggested by Bodhi in Nāṇamoli (1995: 1356 note 1291), assuming that perhaps the discourse "was later modified after the founding of the Bhikkhunī Sangha to bring the latter into the scheme of offerings to the Sangha". To me this seems to be less probable than Harvey's suggestion, since during such an editorial updating of the text it would have been natural to simultaneously clarify the status of Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī, which could have been done easily by including the granting of her going forth among the favours she had received from the Buddha.

²⁵ MN 142 at MN III 253,23: *Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī Buddhaṃ saraṇaṃ gatā, dhammaṃ saraṇaṃ gatā, saṅghaṃ saraṇaṃ gatā ... pāṇātipātā paṭiviratā adinnādānā paṭiviratā kāmesu micchācārā paṭiviratā musāvādā paṭiviratā surāmerayamajjapamādaṭṭhānā paṭiviratā.*

²⁶ Cf. e.g. MN 65 at MN I 445,7 and MĀ 194 at T I 749a13; or else Vin III 9,28 and T 1425 at T XXII 227c2. According to Sp I 213,12, the chief rules (*pārājika* and *saṅghādisesa*)

ANĀLAYO: Theories on the Foundation of the Nun's Order

were promulgated only after the *Saṅgha* had been in existence for a period of twenty years.

²⁷ Ps V 66,15 suggests that this offer happened during the first visit of the Buddha to his home town. A problem with this suggestion is the presence of Ānanda during the offer of the cloth, who is explicitly introduced as a monk, cf. MN 142 at MN III 253,17: *āyasmā Anando*, MĀ 180 at T I 722a5: 尊者阿難, T 84 at T I 903c10: 尊者阿難, and *Q mngon pa, tu* 289b6 (D ju 254a6): *tshe dang ldan pa kun dga' bo*. Though according to Vin II 182,25 Ānanda ordained on the occasion of this visit by the Buddha to his home town, other canonical Pāli texts give the impression as if he only went forth about twenty years after the Buddha had started to teach. According to Th 1039-1040, Ānanda had been a *sekha* for twenty-five years. SN 22.83 at SN III 106,3 and Vin II 183,21 place his stream-entry shortly after his going forth, and Vin II 286,11 indicates that he became an *arahant* only after the Buddha's demise. From this it would follow that he only went forth some twenty-five years before the Buddha passed away, and thus about twenty years after the beginning of the Buddha's ministry. In this case, the events depicted in MN 142 and its parallels would have to be placed considerably later than suggested by the commentary.

²⁸ According to this regulation, a monk should not accept the gift of a robe from a nun who is not related to him, which implies that such a gift is acceptable if they are relatives. This regulation can be found in the Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya*, T 1428 at T XXII 606c11; the Mahāsāṅghika *Vinaya*, T 1425 at T XXII 299c19; the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya*, T 1421 at T XXII 26c6; the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, T 1442 at T XXIII 727a29; the Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, T 1435 at T XXIII 42c13; and the Theravāda *Vinaya* at Vin III 209,15.

²⁹ T 84 at T I 903c22: 摩訶波闍波提苾芻尼。

³⁰ AN 1.14 at AN I 25,17 and EĀ 5.1 at T II 558c21.

³¹ T 203 at T IV 470a21 continues by describing how Maitreya accepted Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī's robe, after the Buddha had refused it. Thus T 203 does not combine the offer of the robe with a listing of recipients of gifts. Another case is the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya*, T 1421 at T XXII 185b20, which precedes its account of the foundation of the order of nuns with Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī's attempt to offer a robe to the Buddha. Here, too, the question of recipients of gifts does not arise. For a survey of these and similar tales cf. Lamotte (1958: 779-782).

³² Examples would be the detailed description of various aspects of the path in MN 77 at MN II 11,3 - 20,13 or MN 151 at MN III 295,13 - 297,20, absent from their Chinese parallels MĀ 207 at T I 783b15 and SĀ 236 at T II 57b24; or else the supramundane treatment of path factors in MN 117 at MN III 72,16 etc.; not found in its Chinese and Tibetan parallels MĀ 189 at T I 735c18 and *Q mngon pa, thu* 83b5 (D nyu 44a5); or perhaps the instructions on the elements in MN 62 at MN I 421,27 - 423,3 not found in the Chinese parallel EĀ 17.1 at T II 582a13, though a similar instruction on the elements involving the same protagonists can be found in AN 4.177 at AN II 164,26 - 165,11. For a more detailed discussion of these cases cf. Anālayo (2005).

³³ References to the "come nun" ordination – found e.g. at Thī 109 and in the Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya*, T 1428 at T XXII 714a17; in the 'Haimavata' *Vinaya*, T 1463 at T XXIV 803b26; in the Saṃmatīya *Vinaya*, T 1461 at T XXIV 668c21; in the Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, T 1435 at T XXIII 426b12; and in the Theravāda *Vinaya*, Vin IV 214,6 (cf. in more detail Anālayo (2009)) – would only conflict with the *garudharma* stipulation, found in several *Vinayas*, that from the outset nuns had to be ordained by both monastic assemblies (on which cf. also below note 34). Otherwise, a "come nun" ordination could easily be envisaged as taking place after Gautamī had gone forth.

³⁴ Von Hinüber (2008: 19) also refers to the probationary period to be observed by a *sikkhamānā* as another case where "a tradition alien to Buddhism is perpetuated". The two years probationary period does not seem to have been established at the time the order of nuns was founded, in spite of what the respective *garudharma* suggests, since several *Vinayas* refer to the problem caused by giving full ordination to a pregnant woman. Such a case could not have arisen if women had to observe a two years' period of celibacy before being ordained, cf. Heirman (1997: 60-61) and Hüsken (1997: 353), a problem also noted by von Hinüber (2008: 19 note 50). Therefore the topic of the *sikkhamānā* training, treated e.g. in Shih (2000: 406-453) and Heirman (2008), would not be of direct relevance to the question of when the nuns' order was founded and thus can be left aside in the present context.

³⁵ It puzzles me that von Hinüber does not refer to Shih's work at all, even though Shi's research on the subject of "*Vuṭṭhāna* in the *Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha*" is mentioned right at the outset of an article on "*Vuṭṭhāpeti*, *vuṭṭhāna* and related matter" by Norman (2001), an article which von Hinüber (2008: 17 note 41 and 18 note 45) quotes twice.

³⁶ Von Hinüber (1992: 56): "Sprache der Jainas ... der spät- und nachkanonischen der Buddhisten nähert sich den alten Schichten im Pāli".

³⁷ Von Hinüber (1999: 88), in relation to the formulation of a rule in the *Nisīhasutta*, remarks that "die Jainas könnten sich hier also an buddhistische Vorbilder anlehnen", adding, however, "doch ist zu bedenken, daß dieser Satzbau bei der Formulierung von Vorschriften nicht eben ferne liegt".

³⁸ The composite nature and relative lateness of several parts of the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* and its parallel versions has been highlighted by various scholars, some of the relevant publications would be: An (2001); Bureau (1979); Dutt (1957: 47); Norman (1983: 37-38); Pachow (1945/1946); Pande (1957: 98-106); Przyłuski (1918-1920); Rhys Davids (1910: 71-73); Snellgrove (1973); Waldschmidt (1939); Waldschmidt (1948: 335-354); Williams (1970) and Winternitz (1920: 29-32).

³⁹ Independent of whether the hypothesis regarding the origin of the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* as part of a chronological *Vinaya* narration is accepted or not, as suggested by Frauwallner (1956: 42-52), from the perspective of a stratification of the Pāli canon the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* is probably best considered on a par with the narrative portions of the *Vinaya*.

⁴⁰ Von Hinüber (2008: 21 note 58) also briefly refers to the entry on *bhikṣuṇī* in the Sanskrit dictionary based on the Turfan findings. The 'fragmentary' condition of this source material makes it doubtful to what degree it can be used to evaluate the frequency with which a particular term occurs in the canons of the respective Buddhist schools.

⁴¹ MN 142 at MN III 255,29: *Buddhapamukhe ubhatoṣaṅghe dānaṃ deti*; MĀ 180 at T I 722a23: 施佛及比丘眾; T 84 at T I 904a16: 施佛現前諸苾芻眾; Q *mngon pa, tu* 290a8 (D *ju* 255a1): *sangs rgyas la mngon du phyogs te dge slong gi dge* (D: *dke*) '*dun la sbyin pa byin na*. The reading in the Chinese and Tibetan versions thus corresponds to the expression *Buddhapamukhaṃ bhikkhusaṅghaṃ*, frequently found elsewhere in the Pāli canon.

⁴² MN 142 at MN III 255,33: *bhikkhunīsaṅghe* (B^e reads *bhikkhunisaṅghe*); MĀ 180 at T I 722a26: 比丘尼眾; T 84 at T I 904a18: 苾芻尼眾; Q *mngon pa, tu* 290b1 (D *ju* 255a2): *dge slong ma'i dge 'dun*. That MĀ 180 and T 84 explicitly mention the nuns could also be gathered from the full English translations of both discourses provided in Tsukamoto (1985: 1093-1100), or from the extracts translated in Silk (2003: 149-150).

⁴³ The respective rules can be found in the Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya*, T 1428 at T XXII 652b26, T XXII 652c29 and T XXII 650a12; in the Mahāsaṅghika *Vinaya*, Tatia (1975:

ANĀLAYO: Theories on the Foundation of the Nun's Order

21,15, 21,18 and 21,6); in the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya*, T 1421 at T XXII 48b18, T XXII 48c13 and T XXII 46b12; in the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, Banerjee (1977: 34,15, 34,18 and 34,8); in the Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, von Simson (2000: 210,5, 210,9 and 210,1); and in the Theravāda *Vinaya*, Vin IV 62,28, Vin IV 64,30 and Vin IV 55,9.

⁴⁴ Ud 4.8 at Ud 43-45.

⁴⁵ Dh-p-a III 474; cf. also Jā II 415.

⁴⁶ T 198 at T IV 176c3, translated in Bapat (1945: 156-158). In the Pāli tradition, this tale is only found in the respective commentary, Pj II 518.

⁴⁷ Ps III 346,16 referring to MN 88 at MN II 112, which has a parallel in MĀ 214 at T I 797c.

⁴⁸ T 2085 at T LI 860c17 and T 2078 at T LI 899c20; for further references to parallels see Deeg (2005: 307-308) and Lamotte (1944: 507 note 1).

⁴⁹ Dh-p-a III 178; cf. also Jā IV 187.

⁵⁰ Dutt (1984: 161,1) and T 212 at T IV 663c18.

⁵¹ T 2085 at T LI 860c20 and T 2078 at T LI 900a12, for further references to parallels see Deeg (2005: 310-312) or Lamotte (1944: 123 note 1).

⁵² Feer (1897: 316) suggests that both tales might stem from a single occasion.

⁵³ SN 55.11 at SN V 360,24.

⁵⁴ AN 8.53 at AN IV 280,17 (cf. also Vin II 258,31).

⁵⁵ AN 8.53 at AN IV 280,13 (Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī's request), for counterparts to this pericope cf. e.g. MN 145 at MN III 267,6; SN 13.1 at SN II 244,18; SN 22.35 at SN III 35,5; SN 22.36 at SN III 36,14; SN 22.63 at SN III 73,22; SN 22.64 at SN III 75,1; SN 22.65 at SN III 75,25; SN 22.66 at SN III 76,14; SN 22.158 at SN III 187,8; SN 23.23-34 at SN III 198,15 + 199,12; SN 35.64 at SN IV 37,20; SN 35.76 at SN IV 48,17; SN 35.86 at SN IV 54,17; SN 35.88 at SN IV 60,9; SN 35.89 at SN IV 63,22; SN 35.95 at SN IV 72,4; SN 35.161 at SN IV 145,8; SN 47.3 at SN V 142,27; SN 47.15 at SN V 165,7; SN 47.16 at SN V 166,14; SN 47.46 at SN V 187,10; SN 47.47 at SN V 188,4; AN 4.254 at AN II 248,12; AN 7.79 at AN IV 143,17 and AN 8.63 at AN IV 299,10.

⁵⁶ AN 8.53 at AN IV 281,2, cf. also the parallel SHT III 994 folio 17 R1 in Waldschmidt (1971: 255). According to Mp IV 137,27, due to the instruction given by the Buddha on this occasion she became fully liberated.

⁵⁷ Cf. e.g. MN 3 at MN I 13,30; AN 5.96 at AN III 120,11; AN 5.97 at AN III 120,26; AN 5.98 at AN III 121,12 and AN 10.85 at AN V 159,10. The same is the case for Th 926; and may also apply to Sn 144, where monastic status seems to be implied in the reference to being "not greedy (when begging) among families" (trsl. by Norman (1992: 17)), found in the same verse. Edgerton (1953: 267) under *durbhara-tā* has the entry: "*hard to satisfy ... insatiableness*, of a monk as regards alms food", cf. also *ibid.* 601 that *subhara* is "said of monks".

⁵⁸ Vin I 355,18; Vin II 258,12; Vin III 235,4; and Vin IV 262,2.

⁵⁹ The Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya* T 1428 reports such meetings at T XXII 618a24; T XXII 647b21; T XXII 648b7; T XXII 648c8; T XXII 737c17; T XXII 853c27; T XXII 883a29; and T XXII 927a18. The Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya* T 1421 reports such meetings at T XXII 25b24; T XXII 26b6; T XXII 26c21; T XXII 36a29; T XXII 45a18; T XXII 45b7; T XXII 45b19; T XXII 46b27; T XXII 47c25; T XXII 48a1; T XXII 87a22; T XXII 160b22; and T XXII 186b3. The Chinese version of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya* reports such meetings in T 1442 at T XXIII 727c14; T XXIII 739b18; T XXIII 739c24; T XXIII 792a23; T XXIII 793c7; T XXIII 794a4; T XXIII 804c1; T 1443 at T XXIII 941a18; T XXIII 941c15; T XXIII 941c23; T XXIII 955a16; T XXIII 964a12; T 1448 at T XXIV 44c1; T 1451 at T XXIV 248a18; T XXIV 248b16; T XXIV 265b12; T XXIV 278b2; and T XXIV 359b18.

The Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya* T 1435 reports such meetings at T XXIII 50b8; T XXIII 80c23; T XXIII 216a13; T XXIII 281a24; T XXIII 281b12; T XXIII 293c6; and T XXIII 358a29.

⁶⁰ MN 146 at MN III 270,21.

⁶¹ SĀ 276 at T II 73c18: 世尊為摩訶波闍波提比丘尼說法; SHT VI 1226 folio 5Rb-c in Bechert (1989: 22), which has preserved (*saṃpra*)*harṣayitvā samāda[pa](yitvā)* and (*bhagavato bhāṣita*)[*m-abhi*]*nanditvā anu(m)o(ditvā)*, making it clear that here, too, the Buddha gave a talk to the nuns; as it the case for the parallel version in the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, T 1442 at T XXIII 792a25: 爾時世尊為大世主等宣說法要; and Q 'dul ba rnam par 'byed pa, nye 49a7 (D ja 51b3): *bcom ldan 'das skye dgu'i bdag mo chen mo gau ta mī la chos dang ldan pa'i bka' mchid kyis yang dag par ston par mdzad*.

⁶² MN 44 at MN I 299-305; MĀ 210 at T I 790a23; Q *mngon pa, tu* 12a7 (D ju 11a3).

⁶³ AN 4.170 at AN II 157,1: *yo hi koci, āvuso, bhikkhu vā bhikkhunī vā*, whereas the description of the four ways at AN II 157,4+10+15+20 invariably refers to a *bhikkhu* only. The concluding statement at AN II 157,24 again reads: *yo hi koci, āvuso, bhikkhu vā bhikkhunī vā*.

⁶⁴ SĀ 560 at T II 146c-147a uses 比丘, 比丘尼 throughout its exposition.

⁶⁵ AN 10.14 at AN V 17,16: *yassa kassaci, bhikkhave, bhikkhussa vā bhikkhuniyā vā*, followed by referring to a *bhikkhu* only in the actual treatment until coming to a summary statement at AN V 19,5+12, where again the expression *bhikkhussa vā bhikkhuniyā vā* can be found. The same pattern then repeats itself for the second part of the discourse, with the nuns mentioned at the outset and end, AN V 19,16, AN V 20,29, and AN V 21,6, but not during the actual exposition.

⁶⁶ MĀ 206 at T I 780b17 and EĀ 51.4 at T II 817a17: 若比丘, 比丘尼.

⁶⁷ MN 16 at MN I 101-104 speaks throughout of a *bhikkhu* only.

⁶⁸ Hinüber (2008: 24 note 74): "Schubring as note 46 above, p. 30 § 20"; *ibid.* note 46 then gives the full bibliographical information: "W. Schubring: Die Lehre der Jaina nach den alten Quellen dargestellt, Berlin 1935".

⁶⁹ Schubring (1935: 30): "an der Spitze der Nonnen stand Ajja-Candaṇā, von der wir auch Vīy. 458b hören, als Mahāvīra ihr seine Mutter Devāṇandā zuführt"; cf. also the translation in Schubring (1962: 39): "the nuns were headed by Ajja-Candaṇā also referred to by Vīy. 458b where it tells us of Mahāvīra introducing his mother Devāṇandā to her".

⁷⁰ According to the Śvetāmbara tradition, Devāṇandā had been his mother only at conception, after which the gods removed him from her womb and placed him into the womb of another woman, cf. *Jinacaritra* (26) in Jacobi (1879: 40).

⁷¹ Doshi (1974: 454,17): *tae ṇaṃ samaṇe bhagavaṃ Mahāvīre Devāṇaṃdaṃ māhaṇiṃ sayam-eva pavvāveti, sayam-eva muṇḍāveti, sayam-eva ajja-Caṃḍaṇāe ajjāe sīsīṇittāe dalayai. tae ṇaṃ sā ajja-Caṃḍaṇā ajjā Devāṇaṃdaṃ māhaṇiṃ ...* (etc.).

⁷² *Jinacaritra* (134-5) counts 14.000 monks and 36.000 nun disciples under Mahāvīra. According to the same work, nuns outnumbered monks already under several of Mahāvīra's predecessors, thus *Jinacaritra* (161-2) counts 16.000 monks and 38.000 nuns under Parśva; (176-7) counts 18.000 monks and 40.000 nuns under Ariṣṭanemi; and (214-5) counts 84.000 monks and 300.000 nuns under Rṣabha; cf. Jacobi (1879: 66, 69, 71 and 75).

⁷³ The first story of Goyama in Modi (1932: 4,15, pagination of the text edition), cf. also Barnett (1973: 58), sets the pattern for such requesting permission, which is then to be repeated for the subsequent stories that are given only in an abbreviated manner.

ANĀLAYO: Theories on the Foundation of the Nun's Order

⁷⁴ The story of Kālī in Modi (1932: 53,22), cf. also Barnett (1973: 98), sets the pattern for such requesting permission, which here is addressed to and then granted by Ajja Candaṇā.

⁷⁵ Roth (1983: 139 note 92) explains that even today Jainas use masculine forms when addressing a woman in order to express reverence.

⁷⁶ My presentation is based on the summary provided in Roth (1983: 49-55).

⁷⁷ See in more detail Jaini (1991).

⁷⁸ This is the case for the Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya*, T 1428 at T XXII 923a22; the 'Haimavata' *Vinaya*, T 1463 at T XXIV 803b9; the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya*, T 1421 at T XXII 185c16; and the Theravāda *Vinaya* at Vin II 254,29. Women are, however, considered to be incapable of becoming a Buddha, cf. e.g. MN 115 at MN III 65,24, where one of the parallel versions, MĀ 181 at T I 723c28 - 724b26, does not have a comparable statement (I intend to discuss this issue in more detail in another paper).

⁷⁹ 4.11-12 and 5.11-12 in Schubring (1918: 20,21 and 23,15). Von Hinüber (2008: 17 note 43, p. 18 note 46) refers to these two chapters in the *Vavahāra*, so that he would have been aware of the above-quoted rules, which perhaps he did not consider to fit the category of "set of rules".

⁸⁰ 7.15-16 in Schubring (1918: 28,5): *tivāsa-pariyāe samaṇe nigganthe tīsaṃvāsa-pariyāe samaṇe nigganthe kappai uvajjhāyattāe uddisittāe. pañcavāsa-pariyāe samaṇe nigganthe saṭṭhivāsa-pariyāe samaṇe nigganthe kappai āyariya-uvajjhāyattāe uddisittāe*. Schubring (1962: 255-256, § 141) explains that "the *uvajjhāya* in order to meet the demands of his position must have been a monk for three years running ... while the office of an *āy.-uv.* asks for five years"; "to rise to the rank of an *uvajjhāya* it takes a nun 30 years and even 60 years before she is able to become an *āy.-uv.* (Vav. 7,15f)"; cf. also Deo (1956: 467 and 473). As noted by Shāntā (1997: 417), this regulation reflects an attitude "of overbearing masculine superiority".

⁸¹ For a few examples of additional rules for Jaina nuns cf. Deo (1956: 485).

⁸² The *Therīgāthā* is not the only such instance in the history of Buddhism, another similar case would be the records of eminent nuns in China during the fourth to sixth century, T 2063 at T L 934a-948a, translated in Tsai (1994).

⁸³ Several such instances from the Pāli *Nikāyas* have been referred to by von Hinüber (2008: 20 note 53 and 22-24) himself, though due to focussing only on those instances where the Buddha directly addresses nuns he does not seem to consider these instances as conflicting with his hypothesis.

⁸⁴ Cf. the Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya*, T 1428 at T XXII 967b24; the Mahāsāṅghika *Vinaya*, T 1425 at T XXII 492c17; the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya*, T 1421 at T XXII 191c17; the Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, T 1435 at T XXIII 450a26; and the Theravāda *Vinaya* at Vin II 288,23.

⁸⁵ For references cf. e.g. Findly (1985: 38-42); Kabilsingh (1984: 4-8); Lindquist (2008: 407 note 5); for a general survey cf. Basham (1954: 177-183).

⁸⁶ Cf. e.g. Ap 17.148 at Ap 540,13; EĀ 52.1 at T II 822a23; T 144 at T II 868a10; T 201 at T IV 336a15; and T 1451 at T XXIV 248c20.

⁸⁷ MN 115 at MN III 65,10: *aṭṭhānam etaṃ anavakāso yaṃ diṭṭhisampanno puggalo aññaṃ saṭṭhāraṃ uddiseyya, n' etaṃ ṭhānaṃ vijjati* (S^c just reads *aṭṭhānam anavakāso*, without *etaṃ*). The formulation of this impossibility in the parallel versions differs, cf. MĀ 181 at T I 724a6 and Q *mdo sde, lu* 329b2 (D *sha* 300b4), or the *sūtra* quotation in T 776 at T XVII 713c1, though it would imply the same basic point.

⁸⁸ A more detailed examination of this contrast is forthcoming in Anālayo (2009).

⁸⁹ Just to summarize again: The hypothesis (I) that the account of the foundation of the nuns' order was devised only within the Sthavira tradition(s) does not take into account the Lokuttara-Mahāsāṅghika *Vinaya* preserved in Sanskrit. The assumption (II) that an alter-

native account can be found in the *Mātrisimit* does not take the *Dakkhiṇāvibhaṅga-sutta* and its Chinese parallels into consideration and falls short of appreciating the canonical records of lay disciples who have reached various levels of awakening. The conjecture (III) that nuns may already have been in existence before Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī went forth stands in contrast to one of the Chinese parallels to the *Dakkhiṇāvibhaṅga-sutta* and to the canonical sources that depict her role as an eminent disciple, her activities as a spokeswoman for the nuns in relation to various *Vinaya* regulations and her position as the woman instrumental in getting the Buddha's permission to start an order of nuns. The suggestion (IV) that the order of nuns was founded only after the Buddha's demise does not give adequate consideration to canonical passages that imply co-existence of the Buddha and the nuns and leaves out of account relevant canonical texts found outside of the four Pāli *Nikāyas*.

⁹⁰ A powerful example for the potential of approaching a text on its own terms seems to me to be the study of the *Ugrapariprocchā* by Nattier (2003); another more recent example would be the examination of the *Mahāsudassana-sutta* by Gethin (2006).