Article

A Preliminary Report on the Sanskrit Manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*

Hyebin Lee

Norwegian Institute of Philology, 0302 Oslo, Norway; hyebin2@nate.com

Abstract: The discovery of the Schøyen–Virginia manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha* provides significant insights into the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*. This newly identified Sanskrit manuscript offers a fresh perspective on monastic law codes, contributing original Sanskrit terms previously known only through Tibetan and Chinese translations, thereby enhancing our knowledge of Sanskrit–Tibetan–Chinese *Vinaya* terminologies. Also, by adding itself as a new textual witness to the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, it demonstrates the complex textual history and underscores the potential multiplicity in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* traditions or even the "Greater Sarvāstivāda" *Vinaya* traditions. Variations in chapter sequencing across extant versions of the *Uttaragrantha* suggest the possibility of the chapters originally existing as independent texts rather than as a collective, the *Uttaragrantha*. This article presents the latest findings on the Sanskrit manuscript fragments of the *Uttaragrantha* in the Schøyen Collection and the private collection, Virginia. Furthermore, it attempts to show the role of the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha* in improving our textual understanding of the *Uttaragrantha* and examining the potential multiplicity in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* traditions.

Keywords: Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*; *Uttaragrantha*; Buddhist manuscripts; the Schøyen Collection; *Vinaya* Studies

1. Introduction

The Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, the monastic law code of the Mūlasarvāstivāda, consists of four parts: (1) the two *Vinayavibhaṅga*s, (2) the *Vinayavastu*, (3) the *Vinayakṣudraka* (also known as *Kṣudrakavastu*), and (4) the *Vinayottaragrantha*.[1] Of these, the *Uttaragrantha* has been less extensively explored by scholars for various reasons. The primary reason is the limited availability of Sanskrit and Chinese materials related to the *Uttaragrantha*. Moreover, it was previously considered merely an appendix of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, akin to the *Parivāra* in the Pāli *Vinaya*. However, this perspective began to shift following Schopen's 2004 study (Schopen 2004, pp. 124–27, 270; Kishino 2013), which suggested that the *Uttaragrantha* should not be viewed merely as an appendix but as a text intrinsically integrated with and essential to the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*. Since becoming known to scholars at the end of the last century, Sanskrit manuscripts of the *Uttaragrantha* in the Schøyen Collection and a private collection, Virginia, have provided significant insights into their historical significance in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*. This paper aims to present the latest findings on the Sanskrit manuscript fragments of the *Uttaragrantha* from these two collections. The new findings shed new light on texts previously accessible only through Tibetan and Chinese translations, suggesting their original forms. This enhances research on the *Vinaya* corpus with original Sanskrit terms and adds a new textual witness to the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*.

2. The Extant Sanskrit Fragments of the *Uttaragrantha*

2.1. The *Uttaragrantha*

The *Uttaragrantha* is the final part of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*. The *Uttaragrantha*, viewed by modern scholars as an "appendix" to the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* and likened

to the *Parivāra* of the Pāli *Vinaya*, has been re-evaluated in recent scholarship. To be specific, the *Uttaragrantha* is estimated to have been composed around the same time as, or possibly even earlier than, other parts of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* (Schopen 2004, pp. 124–25).[2] This contrasts with the *Parivāra* of the Theravāda *Vinaya*, which is considered to have been composed later than the other parts of the *Vinaya*.[3] This re-evaluation is supported by references to the *Uttaragrantha* in significant *Vinaya* works by Viśeṣamitra and Guṇaprabha, attesting to its established scriptural authority by the 6th to 7th centuries. Moreover, the existence of translations into Tibetan and Chinese suggests that this text was accepted as an important scriptural source in India, suggesting a reassessment of its role. Despite its historical importance, the *Uttaragrantha* has received comparatively less scholarly attention, partly due to limited access to the original Sanskrit materials.

While no Indic version of the *Uttaragrantha* has survived in its entirety, the Tibetan Kanjur includes two translations: the complete *'Dul ba gźuṅ dam pa* (D 7[b]/P 1037, 53 bam pos) and the incomplete *'Dul ba gźuṅ bla ma* (D 7[a]/P 1036, 11 bam pos).[4] It is unknown why these two versions were produced.[5] The complete *Uttaragrantha*, the *'Dul ba gźuṅ dam pa*, is thought to have been translated by the early 9th century; unfortunately, the translator's name is not mentioned in its colophon (Clarke 2015, p. 77).[6] The *'Dul ba gźuṅ dam pa* consists of ten or eleven chapters depending on whether the *Upāliparipṛcchā*, which is located at the end of the *Uttaragrantha*, is counted as one chapter.[7] The chapters are *Upāli-paripṛcchā*, the *Vinītakā*, the *Ekottarikā, the *Pañcaka, the *Ṣoḍaśaka, the *Nidāna*, the *Muktaka*, the *Kathāvastu*, the *Māṇavikā*, and the *Mātṛkā*. Furthermore, Yijing's Chinese translations of the *Uttaragrantha*, while not complete, include two chapters: the *Nidāna* (*Nituona* 尼陀那) and *Muktaka* (*Mudejia* 目得迦) in one text titled *Genben shuo yiqie youbu nituona mudejia* (根本說一切有部尼陀那目得迦, T. 1452), produced in 703 CE.[8]

There are also other Chinese texts which are related to the *Uttaragrantha*. First, the *Sapoduobu pini modeleqie* 薩婆多部毘尼摩得勒伽 (T.1441 [23]), translated by Saṅghavarman (僧伽跋摩) in 435 CE, is considered relevant to the *Uttaragrantha*, although it had been misunderstood as a commentary on the *Shisong lü*. Current scholars (Clarke 2004, 2015; Kishino 2008, 2013) suggest that this text is closely related to the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, particularly the *Uttaragrantha*, based on the similarities in structure and content. Second, a certain part of the *Shisong lü* 十誦律 (T.1435 [23]) corresponds to sections of the *Uttaragrantha*, even though the *Shisong lü* itself is not a translation of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* but a *Vinaya* belonging to the "Greater Sarvāstivāda", as termed by Dhammadinnā.[9] The *Shisong lü*, translated between 404 and 409 CE, was the result of a complex process that involved various translators, including Kumārajīva, *Puṇyatāra (Furuoduoluo 弗若多羅), *Dharmaruci (Tanmoliuzhi 曇摩流支), and Vimalākṣa (Beimoluocha 卑摩羅叉). Specifically, Recitations 8–10 of the *Shisong lü* correspond to the eight chapters, namely the *Nidāna*, the *Ekottarikā, the *Kathāvastu*, the *Upāliparipṛcchā*, the *Māṇavikā*, the *Mātṛkā*, the *Vinītakā*, and the *Muktaka*.[10]

The *Uttaragrantha* deals with a wide range of topics addressed in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, which can be categorized as follows: (1) regulations or explanations identical or similar to those found in other parts of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*; (2) regulations or explanations that are not identical but related to the *Vinaya* rules previously established in the other parts of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*; and (3) regulations or definitions of certain items introduced for the first time, although they are not entirely new and they are treated or referenced in other parts of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*. In terms of structure, the *Uttaragrantha* predominantly utilizes *piṇḍoddāna*s and *uddāna*s to organize its topics.[11] While some chapters, like the *Upāliparipṛcchā*, *Ekottarikā, *Pañcaka, *Nidāna*, *Muktaka*, and *Māṇavikā*, utilize both systems for thematic division, others, such as the *Vinītakā* and *Ṣoḍaśaka, employ only the *uddāna* system. The *Kathāvastu* and *Mātṛkā* chapters do not use these systems. The contents of the *Uttaragrantha* can be broadly categorized into three types: (1) a series of question-and-answer sessions between Upāli and the Buddha, (2) narrative stories in which the Buddha establishes regulations, and (3) chapters that incorporate both elements.

2.2. Sanskrit Uttaragrantha Fragments in the British Library Hoernle Collection (London) and the Turfan Collection (Berlin)

Until the discovery of a substantial portion of the Sanskrit manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha* in the Schøyen collection and the private collection, Virginia, only fragments, which are detailed in the following, were known to modern scholars, along with citations in later commentaries, such as Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtravṛttyabhidhāna-svavyākhyāna*.[12]

The Hoernle Collection includes a total of eight fragments from the *Mātṛkā* chapter. Three of these fragments belong to the *Pratisaṃyuktakhaṇḍaka* (Or.15003/178, 15009/195, and 15009/271),[13] while the rest belong to another section, the *Vṛttakhaṇḍaka* (Or.15007/504, 15009/48, 15009/57, 15009/443, and 15011/1).[14] The Turfan Collection contains several fragments belonging to the *Upāliparipṛcchā*, *Kathāvastu*, *Mātṛkā*, and *Muktaka* chapters of the *Uttaragrantha*, all of which are accessible through the series *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden* (SHT III 937, SHT V 1068, SHT VIII 1943, and SHT XII 7185).[15]

2.3. Uttaragrantha Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection and the Private Collection, Virginia

Academic attention was first drawn to the *Uttaragrantha* manuscript in the Schøyen Collection around the turn of the century. In 2000, Gregory Schopen mentioned its existence, referencing transcriptions by Klaus Wille (Schopen 2000, pp. 99–100, 140, I. 9). A subsequent publication in 2006 by Richard Salomon also mentioned the presence of the *Vinaya* and other texts within this intriguing find (Salomon 2006, p. 356). The academic discussion on the *Uttaragrantha* was enriched in 2009 when Wille detailed the manuscripts in the private collection, Virginia, at a conference held at Stanford University. This presentation was refined and published in 2014, spotlighting fragments from eight different manuscripts, including five *Vinaya* texts, that is, the *Vinayavibhaṅga*; *Prātimokṣasūtra*; *Vinayavastu*; and two manuscripts of the *Uttaragrantha*, tentatively called manuscript A and manuscript B (cf. Hartmann and Wille 2014, pp. 145–53 and Yao, forthcoming, 1.1.2. A Brief History of Research on the Bhaiṣajyavastu Fragments).

The *Vinayavibhaṅga* and the *Upāliparipṛcchā* of the *Uttaragrantha* (manuscript B) of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* were examined by Masanori Shōno (2020a, 2020b, 2021), whereas the study of *Uttaragrantha* (manuscript A) had been undertaken by various scholars. Wille first transliterated the *Uttaragrantha* (manuscript A) around 2000 and produced a revised and improved version in 2011.[16] After that, scholars including Shayne Clarke, Fumi Yao, Gudrun Melzer, and Jens Borgland continued the study until 2018. Despite only having access to limited materials, which were preserved as bundles with several folios stuck together, scholars produced foundational, yet unpublished works.[17] Their works included the transliteration and identification of some accessible fragments at that time. Following these endeavors, several scholars, including myself, have further engaged in the study of the *Uttaragrantha* fragments found in the Schøyen Collection, with meetings held at the Norwegian Institute of Philology (hereafter PHI) in 2019, 2020, and 2023.[18] In addition to the outcomes of the meetings at PHI, I have conducted detailed research on the *Uttaragrantha* (manuscript A) of the *Māṇavikā* chapter, along with other related materials in Tibetan and Chinese (Lee, forthcoming).

The *Uttaragrantha* (manuscript B) identified and researched by Shōno, to date, consists of two fragments found in the private collection, Virginia.[19] These Sanskrit fragments, labeled F.15.1 and F.15.3, comprise one folio with both front and back (recto and verso) available, corresponding to *Prātideśanikā* 2–4 of the *Upāliparipṛcchā* in the *Uttaragrantha*, and are written in Gilgit/Bamiyan Type II script.[20] Although only two fragments of the *Uttaragrantha* (manuscript B) have been identified and are exclusively found in the private collection, Virginia, a voluminous amount of the *Uttaragrantha* (manuscript A) is present in the two collections, including, as of March 2024, six chapters of the *Uttaragrantha*: the *Vīnitakā*, the *Māṇavikā*, the *Ekottarikā*, the *Pañcaka*, the *Ṣoḍaśaka*, and the *Nidāna*. The *Uttaragrantha* (manuscript A), which is the primary focus of this article, will be discussed in detail in the following section.

3. The Schøyen–Virginia Manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha* (Manuscript A)

3.1. General Description

The *Uttaragrantha* (manuscript A) is a birch-bark manuscript and is written in Gilgit/ Bāmiyān Type II. Specifically, it seems close to Type B of two sub-groups of Gilgit/Bāmiyān Type II according to Melzer's classification.[21] Paleographic studies and radiocarbon analysis have agreed in suggesting that the *Uttaragrantha* (manuscript A) dates to between 671 AD and 770 AD.[22] It is currently found in two private collections: the major part in the Schøyen Collection in Oslo, Norway; and the rest in the private collection in Virginia, USA. A preliminary investigation by Yao revealed that the *Uttaragrantha* (manuscript A) was combined with the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* manuscript, forming a continuous text in a single manuscript.[23] This combined manuscript has been named the "*Bhaiṣajyavastu-Uttaragrantha* manuscript", a name coined by Yao (forthcoming, 1.1.2. A Brief History of Research on the Bhaiṣajyavastu Fragments). The *Bhaiṣajyavastu* part of the manuscript is mostly written with eight lines per side, except for several folios of the final part of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, which are written with nine lines (Yao, forthcoming, 1.2.2. General Format and Quality of the Text). This nine-line format appears to be continuously used in the *Uttaragrantha* part.[24] The *Bhaiṣajyavastu-Uttaragrantha* manuscript has one string hole at 1/3 of the length from the left margin of the folio.[25] Folio numbers are found on the left margin of several folios. Where folio numbers are missing due to physical damage, we can often assume them by aligning the surviving Sanskrit text with the Tibetan version. Notably, except for the folios of the *Nidāna* chapter, the identified folios from the *Vinītakā* to *Ṣoḍaśaka* chapters show a continuous sequence, a point that will be detailed in Section 3.2. Extant Chapters in the S-V Manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha*. We now have approximately 52 different folios, each of which consists of several fragments of various sizes. The *Uttaragrantha* part (hereafter, the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha*, or simply the *Uttaragrantha* manuscript) includes six chapters sequenced as follows: the *Vinītakā*[26], the *Māṇavikā*, the *Ekottarikā*, the *Pañcaka*, the *Ṣoḍaśaka*, and the *Nidāna*.

3.2. Extant Chapters in the S-V Manuscript of the Uttaragrantha

The folios detailed below were identified and organized as of March 2024. Future research will involve more identified fragments in the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha*.

3.2.1. The *Vinītakā* Chapter

According to Clarke (2015, pp. 77–78), the *Vinītakā* chapter deals with case law related to the first nine offenses in the *Bhikṣuprātimokṣa*, including the four *pārājika*s and five *saṅghāvaśeṣa*s.

Fragments of the *Vinītakā* chapter are found in both collections. The majority is found in the private collection, Virginia, and the last folio of the *Vinītakā* is included in the Schøyen collection. Many fragments in the private collection, Virginia, remain in bundles with several folios stuck together, and consequently many folios inside are inaccessible. Accordingly, only 16 folios have been identified although the *Vinītakā* chapter consists of 23 folios, 206–228.

As aforementioned, the *Uttaragrantha* manuscript is combined with the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, and the first chapter of the *Uttaragrantha*, followed by the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, is the *Vinītakā* chapter in the S-V manuscript. The first folio of the *Vinītakā* chapter starts at 206r in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu-Uttaragrantha* manuscript, as the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* seems to end at 205v.[27] However, the fragments of this first folio are notably partial, preserving only a small portion of the left margin in which the digit 6 from 206 survives. The final folio of the *Vinītakā* contains a colophon in which the Sanskrit title is attested.[28]

The identified folios of the *Vinītakā* chapter in the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha* are arranged with the Tibetan version in the following Table 1.[29] Due to the fragmentary condition of the folios, the location of the Tibetan version is provided from where the first surviving word of the Sanskrit version appears to where the last word does in the folios.[30]

Table 1. Concordance of the folios of the *Vinītakā* chapter and the Tibetan material.

Identified Folios of the *Vinītakā* Chapter in the S-V Manuscript	Tibetan (Derge)
206r	Na 288b5–289a7
206v	Na 289b3–290a6
207r	Na 290b6–291a2
207v	Na 291a7–291b4
208v	Na 293a3–293b2
209r	Na 293b3–294a6
210r	Na 295a6
213v	Na 300b1–301a4
214r	Na 301b3–301b7
215r	Pa 2b2–3
218r	Pa 6b6–7a3
220v	Pa 10b1–5
221v	Pa 12a1–4
222r	Pa 12b6–13b2
223r	Pa 15a3–4
226v	Pa 20b4–7
227v	Pa 21b4–22a5
228r	Pa 22a6–22b2

3.2.2. The *Māṇavikā* Chapter[31]

The *Māṇavikā* chapter explores a wide range of topics through the structure of questions and answers between Upāli and the Buddha. Although the topics are summarized by the *piṇḍoddāna*s and *uddāna*s, they do not necessarily agree on a singular, consistent theme. These topics are related to those found in various *vastu*s of the *Vinayavastu* and the *Kṣudrakavastu*, as well as to regulations (Skt. *śikṣāpada*, Chi. *xuechu* 學處) outlined in the *Prātimokṣasūtra*.[32]

Following the *Vinītakā* chapter in the S-V manuscript, a total of nine folios pertain to the *Māṇavikā* chapter, specifically those numbered 228–236. The majority of the *Māṇavikā* fragments, totaling 116, is found in the Schøyen collection, while six fragments are included in the private collection, Virginia.[33] Regrettably, a portion featuring the title, colophon, or any final sentence that would typically signify the end of a chapter is lost. We cannot directly discern the original Sanskrit title in this manuscript, but the Sanskrit title is attested in Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtra* (VS 14.40) and its autocommentary to VS 1.98.[34] The remaining portions represent approximately 40 percent of the entire text. Table 2 below presents a comparative table of the *Māṇavikā* materials, including two Chinese texts, the *Sapoduobu pini modeleqie* and the *Shisong lü*, which are related to the *Uttaragrantha*, as previously mentioned.[35]

Table 2. Concordance of the folios of the *Māṇavikā* chapter and other materials in Tibetan and Chinese.

Identified Folios of the *Māṇavikā* Chapter in the S-V Manuscript	Tibetan (Derge)	T. 1441 [23]	T. 1435 [23]
228r	Pa 221b5–222a5	605a11–20	405a21–b2
228v	Pa 222a5–223a1	605a21–b6	405b2–15
229r	Pa 223a1–b1	605b6–15	405b15–c10
229v	Pa 223b4–224a5	605b17–c3	405c13–25
230r	Pa 224a5–225a2	605c4–c13	405c26–406b3
230v	Pa 225a4–b5	605c16–23	406b4–14
231r	Pa 225b5–226a6	605c24–606a13	406b14–406c14
231v	Pa 226b3–227a2	606a18–24	406c19–407a8
232r	Pa 227a2–b4	606a24–b11	407a8–27
232v	Pa 227b5–228b1	606b11–15	407a27–b23
233r	Pa 228b1–229a4	606b15–29	407b23–c22
233v	Pa 229a5–230a1	606b29–c11	407c22–408a10
234r	Pa 230a2–b7	606c11–22	408a10–c7[36]
234v	Pa 231a1–b5	606c23–607a6	408c7–409a1
235r	Pa 231b6–232b4	607a7–13	409a2–b12
235v	Pa 232b5–233b2	607a14–24	409b12–c13
236r	Pa 233b3	-	409c16–17

3.2.3. The *Ekottarikā* Chapter

Among the *Uttaragrantha*'s chapters, three chapters bear specific textual characteristics, particularly in their systematic text arrangement: the *Ekottarikā*, the *Pañcaka*, and the *Ṣoḍaśaka*. The title *Ekottarikā* means "Increasing by One" or "Single Increments" (MW, s.v. *ekottara*), reflecting its structured arrangement of topics in an ascending numerical order. This chapter organizes its contents numerically, as established in 10 *uddāna*s within each of the three *piṇḍoddāna*s. It includes discussions on monastic roles, expertise in monastic discipline, significant teachings, and dialogues on understanding the dharma, structured around a unique numerical format for easy navigation and memorization (Clarke 2015, p. 78).

The *Ekottarikā* chapter comprises 13 folios, numbered 236 to 248. All identified fragments of the 13 folios are preserved in the Schøyen collection. Each folio is preserved in varying states of fragmentary condition, yet the entire range of the text, from beginning to end, is currently available. However, a portion containing the title, colophon, or any final sentence is missing, leaving the Sanskrit title unconfirmed in this manuscript. While the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* also does not confirm the Sanskrit title, a variation, "*vinayottarikā*", appears in the Merv manuscript.[37] The identified folios of the *Ekottarikā* chapter in the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha* are arranged with the Tibetan version in Table 3 below.[38]

Table 3. Concordance of the folios of the *Ekottarikā* chapter and the Tibetan material.

Identified Folios of the *Ekottarikā* Chapter In the S-V Manuscript	Tibetan (Derge)
236r	Pa 22b2–23a6
236v	Pa 23a7–24a6
237r	Pa 24a6–25a6
237v	Pa 25a7–26a5
238r	Pa 26a6–27a5
238v	Pa 27a7–28a7
239r	Pa 28b1–29a6
239v	Pa 29a7–30a5
240r	Pa 30a5–31a6
240v	Pa 31b4–32a2
241r	Pa 32a2–7
241v	Pa 33b1–4
242r	Pa 33b5–34b2
242v	Pa 34b5–35b3
243r	Pa 35b3–36b6
243v	Pa 36b7–38a3
244r	Pa 38a4–39a5
244v	Pa 39a7–40b1
245r	Pa 40b1–41b3
245v	Pa 41b5–42b3
246r	Pa 42b4–43a1
246v	Pa 44a1–44b1
247r	Pa 44b1–45b1
247v	Pa 45b2–46b2
248r	Pa 46b2–47a2
248v	Pa 47a5–7

3.2.4. The *Pañcaka* Chapter

As in the *Ekottarikā* chapter, the *Pañcaka* chapter features a systematic arrangement of text, listing terms in groups of five. Clarke (2015, p. 78) notes that this chapter deals with accusations, explaining how monks should report the offenses of their fellow monks and how the accused monk should respond, categorizing different types of offenses into groups of five.

The *Pañcaka* chapter in the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha* comprises nine folios, numbered 248 to 256. Each folio is preserved in varying conditions. The full sequence of folios, from beginning to end, is available. However, a portion containing the title, colophon, or any final sentence of this chapter is also missing, leaving the Sanskrit title unconfirmed. While no other materials of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* confirm the Sanskrit title either, a variation, "*vinayapaṃcika*", is found in the Merv manuscript.[39] The identified folios of the *Pañcaka* chapter in the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha* are arranged with the Tibetan version in the following Table 4.

Table 4. Concordance of the folios of the **Pañcaka* chapter and the Tibetan material.

Identified Folios of the **Pañcaka* Chapter in the S-V Manuscript	Tibetan (Derge)
248v	Pa 47b2–48a1
249r	Pa 48a3–48b5
249v	Pa 48b7–49b3
250r	Pa 49b4–50a7
250v	Pa 50b2–51a4
251r	Pa 51b4–52a2
251v	Pa 52a7–52b2
252r	Pa 52b7–53b3
252v	Pa 53b7–54b4
253r	Pa 54b5–55b3
253v	Pa 55b4–56b2
254r	Pa 56b4–57b1
254v	Pa 57b3–58b1
255r	Pa 58b4–59b6
255v	Pa 59b7–60a6
256r	Pa 60a7–61a4

3.2.5. The **Ṣoḍaśaka* Chapter

The **Ṣoḍaśaka* chapter is a relatively short chapter consisting of a list of 16 topics followed by two further lists of five attributes (Clarke 2015, p. 78). The section primarily deals with the settlement of legal cases, focusing on the *sthalastha* monk as in charge of the settlement procedure (Borgland 2014a, pp. 54–56).

Five folios, numbered 256–260 of the **Ṣoḍaśaka* chapter, are found in the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha*. The text survives from the beginning to approximately 80% toward the end, which means that the part corresponding to Derge Pa 69a–70a is currently missing. Accordingly, a portion typically containing the title, colophon, or any final sentence is missing, leaving the Sanskrit title unconfirmed in this manuscript. This Sanskrit title is not confirmed in other Sanskrit sources of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* either, but the term "*vinayaṣoḍaśika*" is attested in the Merv manuscript.[40] The identified folios of the **Ṣoḍaśaka* chapter in the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha* are arranged with the Tibetan version in the following Table 5.

Table 5. Concordance of the folios of the **Ṣoḍaśaka* chapter and the Tibetan material.

Identified Folios of the **Ṣoḍaśaka* Chapter in the S-V Manuscript	Tibetan (Derge)
256v	Pa 61a5–62a3
257r	Pa 62a6–63a2
257v	Pa 63a5–63b7
258r	Pa 64a2–64b5
258v	Pa 64b5–65b1
259r	Pa 65b2–66a7

Table 5. *Cont.*

Identified Folios of the **Ṣoḍaśaka* Chapter in the S-V Manuscript	Tibetan (Derge)
259v	Pa 66b1–67a5
260r	Pa 67a6–68a3
260v	Pa 68a5–68b7

3.2.6. The *Nidāna* Chapter[41]

The term "*nidāna*" encompasses various meanings such as "cause", "motive", "motivation", "beginning", and "introduction". According to Kishino (2013, p. 50), the *Nidāna* chapter covers a wide range of diverse topics either in a series of questions and answers between Upāli and the Buddha or through narrative stories in which the Buddha establishes regulations. These topics are associated with those found in several *vastu*s and the *Kṣudrakavastu*, and they appear to be organized into a group as outlined in *piṇḍoddāna*s and *uddāna*s. This structuring bears similarities with that of the *Māṇavikā* chapter.

As of March 2024, only four folios of the *Nidāna* chapter are identified in the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha*, which are numbered 283, 284, 285, and 289. These identified folios correspond to 92b–98a and 103b–105b in the Tibetan Derge edition, indicating that the remaining part covers from approximately the 2/7 point to the 3/7 point. The following Table 6 shows the concordance of the four folios with the Tibetan version:

Table 6. Concordance of the folios of the *Nidāna* chapter and the Tibetan material.

Identified Folios of the *Nidāna* Chapter in the S-V Manuscript	Tibetan (Derge)	Chinese (T. 1452 [24]) 根本說一切有部尼陀那目得迦
283r	Pa 92b4–93b1	423c23–424a21
283v	Pa 93b3–94b1	424a26–424b16
284r	Pa 94b1–95a5	424b16–424c12
284v	Pa 95a7–96a6	424c16–425a4
285r	Pa 96a7–97a5	425a9–425a29
285v	Pa 97a7–98a4	425b5–11
289r	Pa 103b6–104b6	427a18–19[42]
289v	Pa 104b7–105b4	-[43]

3.3. The Structure of the Uttaragrantha

In summary, the identified folios of the six chapters in the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha* are sequenced as follows: *Vinītakā* (206r–228r3)–*Māṇavikā* (228r3–236r1)–**Ekottarikā* (236r2–248v3)–**Pañcaka* (248v3–256r9)–**Ṣoḍaśaka* (256v1–260v9)–*Nidāna* (283r1–289v9). Of particular interest is why the *Uttaragrantha* is combined with the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* for reasons not yet clear. Also, the sequence that the *Vinītakā* chapter is positioned as the first chapter in the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha*, is an intriguing aspect of the *Uttaragrantha*'s structure.

Considering the length of the *Nidāna* chapter in the Tibetan version, among the currently missing folios numbered 261–282, approximately one folio is expected to be the final part of the **Ṣoḍaśaka*, and about 21 folios are expected to be part of the *Nidāna*. The sequence of the chapters in the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha* largely aligns with that of the complete Tibetan version of *Uttaragrantha*. However, the *Māṇavikā* chapter is positioned as the second section of the *Uttaragrantha* part of the S-V manuscript, whereas in the Tibetan version, it is the ninth out of ten or eleven sections. The variations in sequence

are found in the two Chinese texts, the *Sapoduobu pini modeleqie* and the *Shisong lü*, differing from both the Tibetan and Sanskrit versions of the *Uttaragrantha*. The *Sapoduobu pini modeleqie* does not include the *Nidāna* and *Muktaka* chapters, following the order: *Kathāvastu–Upāliparipṛcchā*(a)*–Vinītakā–Mātṛkā–Māṇavikā–*Ekottarikā*–Upāliparipṛcchā*(b). The *Shisong lü* does not include the *Pañcaka* and *Soḍaśaka* chapters, and the chapter order also varies from the other versions: *Nidāna–*Ekottarikā*–Kathāvastu–Upaliparipṛcchā–Māṇavikā–Matṛkā–Vinītakā–Muktaka*.[44] A comparison of the structures of the *Uttaragrantha* of the Tibetan and Sanskrit materials and Chinese versions related to the *Uttaragrantha*, the *Sapo-duobu pini modeleqie*, and the *Shisong lü*, is presented in Table 7 below. This table displays the extant chapters of the *Uttaragrantha* from these four sources, highlighting differences in the chapter order among them.

Table 7. Extant chapters of the *Uttaragrantha* from the four sources and a comparison of chapter order.

Tibetan Version	The S-V Manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha*	T. 1441 [23] The *Sapoduobu pini modeleqie*		T. 1435 [23] The *Shisong lü* (Recitation 8–10)	
Upāliparipṛcchā	*Vinītakā*	*Kathāvastu*	毘尼衆分事 (565a14–569b29)	*Nidāna*[45] (346a7–352b26)	Recitation 8 八誦 (346a5–378c7): 毘尼增一法 (346a10–369b24) 增一後 (369b25–378c7)
Vinītakā	*Māṇavikā*	*Upāliparipṛcchā*	優波離問分別波羅提木叉 (569c1–579b25)' 優波離問事 (579b26–582b12)	*Ekottarikā* (352b27–354c8; 355c10–373c6)	
Ekottarikā	*Ekottarikā*	*Vinītakā*	毘尼摩得勒伽雜事[46] (582b13–593b20)	*Kathāvastu* (373c7–378c6)	
Pañcaka	*Pañcaka*	*Mātṛkā*	毘尼摩得勒伽雜事 (593b21–605a5)	*Upāliparipṛcchā* (379a3–405a20)	Recitation 9 九誦 優波離問部 (379a1–409c19)
Soḍaśaka	*Soḍaśaka*	*Māṇavikā*	毘尼摩得勒伽雜事 (605a9–607a25)	*Māṇavikā* (405a21–409c18)[47]	
Nidāna	*Nidāna*	*Ekottarikā*	毘尼摩得勒伽雜事 (607a25–611b11)	*Mātṛkā* (410a5–423b9)	Recitation 10 十誦 (410a1–470b20): 比尼誦 (410a5–445c6) 五百比丘結集三藏法品 (445c13–450a26) 七百比丘集滅惡法品 (450a27–456b8) 毘尼中雜品 (456b9–461b29) 因緣品 (461c1–470b19)
Muktaka		*Upāliparipṛcchā*	優波離問波羅夷; 問十三僧伽婆尸沙; 問三十事; 問波夜提; 問波羅提提舍尼事 (611b15–626b9)	*Vinītakā* (424b16–445a12)	
Kathāvastu				*Muktaka* (456b9–470b19)	
Māṇavikā					
Mātṛkā					

It is unclear which chapter sequence is the earliest. Currently, it is not possible to determine whether the sequence found in our extant Tibetan version reflects the order in the Indic originals used by the translators, or if it was later adjusted by them. Despite these uncertainties, two key observations can be underscored: First, the variation in chapter order across all versions may provide evidence of the multiplicity of the *Vinaya*s of the Mūlasarvāstivāda. Second, the difference in chapter sequence across the four sources suggests that each chapter of the *Uttaragrantha* may have initially existed as an independent *Vinaya* text. The texts of the *Uttaragrantha* are frequently cited in Viśeṣamitra's *Vinaya-saṃgraha* and the commentaries of the Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtra*, but this is done by referring to their specific titles rather than using a collective title *Uttaragrantha*. Also, even though Yijing translated two chapters of the *Uttaragrantha*, no Chinese term for *Uttaragrantha* is found in his works. Furthermore, the title *Uttaragrantha* is not found in any *Vinaya* text written in Sanskrit or other Indic languages, nor is it attested in the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha*. This suggests that the recognition of the title *Uttaragrantha* might not have been widespread or utilized in India during the time of the *Vinaya* scholars around the 6th to 7th century CE. The collective reference to these texts as *Uttaragrantha* could have emerged later, reflecting a development in how these texts were grouped and

conceptualized within the tradition (cf. Kishino 2013, pp. 30–35). It is also supported by the fact that the estimated production of the S-V manuscript falls within the 7th to 8th centuries, overlapping with this timeframe.

4. New Findings from the S-V Manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha*

The S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha* leads to a significant advancement in the study of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, introducing a new textual witness and enhancing research in various aspects. The understanding of the *Uttaragrantha*, accessible through Tibetan and Chinese translations, has been challenging due to the considerable difference in translation styles from those of the *Vinayavastu*. The S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha* contributes to the expansion of the *Vinaya* corpus with original Sanskrit terms, offering a better understanding of the text. These original Sanskrit terms lead to a more accurate understanding of ambiguous variations of *Vinaya* technical terms in Tibetan and Chinese. An example examined in Table 8 below is the variation of a *Vinaya* technical term in Tibetan compared to the original Sanskrit term in the *Māṇavikā* chapter of the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha*.

Table 8. Tibetan variations of a *Vinaya* technical term, Skt. *chanda*.

Sanskrit in the *Māṇavikā*	Tibetan in the *Māṇavikā*	Sanskrit in the *Vinyavastu* in the MSV	Tibetan in Other Parts, the *Vinayavibhaṅga*s and *Vinayavastu* in the MSV
chanda	*dad pa*	*chanda*	*'dun pa*

The concept of "*chanda*" (consent or approval) plays a crucial role in formal ecclesiastical acts (Skt. *karman*; Tib. *las*; Chi. *jiemo* 羯磨). When the Community performs a formal ecclesiastical act, it is a fundamental principle that all monks within the boundary of that Community participate in the formal act. Participation in the community's *karman* was, according to Hirakawa (1982, p. 20), one of the most important aspects of the group's monastic life. There are two modes of participation. The first is direct personal attendance, and the second is by granting *chanda* "approval, consent (BHSD, s.v. *chanda*)" to another monk, thereby signifying agreement with the results of the *karman*. This indirect mode of participation, through *chanda*, is permitted only in exceptional circumstances, such as when a monk is ill.

It is noteworthy that, in the *Māṇavikā* chapter, the Tibetan rendering of *chanda* differs from that in the *Vinayavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*. Specifically, in the *Māṇavikā*, *chanda* is translated as *dad pa*, which literally means "faith" or "trust", often corresponding to the Sanskrit term *śraddhā* (Negi, s.v. *dad pa*).[48] In contrast, *vastu*s of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, such as the *Karmavastu* and *Adhikaraṇavastu*, use the term *'dun pa*, generally meaning "intention" or "will" as an equivalent of *chanda*.[49] Given the same context in both the *Māṇavikā* and *Adhikaraṇavastu*, or in other vastus where *chanda* appears, the employment of different Tibetan translations prompts the question of why. A plausible explanation might be the involvement of different translators.[50] However, the original Sanskrit term in the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha* helps us to understand the original content of the *Māṇavikā* and confirms that there is a variant translation for *chanda*, which differs from the one more commonly known to modern scholars in the Tibetan translation.

Second, the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha* serves as an invaluable source in providing new textual evidence for verifying the multiplicity of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*. In the following example, the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha* is closer to the *Shisong lü* rather than the Tibetan translation of the *Uttaragrantha*. This not only suggests that the S-V manuscript might originate from a different lineage than the one used for the Tibetan translation among the *Vinaya*s of the Mūlasarvāstivādins, but it also makes us consider that the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* should be understood within the broader context of the *Vinaya*s of the "Greater Sarvāstivāda".

The Tibetan version of the *Māṇavikā* (Derge *'dul ba* pa 223a6–7)

de ñid la sṅa dro ba daṅ | de ñid bdun pa daṅ | de ñid la nam 'tsho'i bar du bar ruṅ ṅam | ruṅ ste śa ni sṅa dro ba'o || de'i 'og tu **btsos pa'i źag** ni bdun pa'o || bdun pa de'i 'og tu bsregs pa'i thal ba ni nam 'tsho'i bar du ba'o ||

[Upāli asked:] "Is it proper that one particular substance can be [the medicine to be consumed] in the morning, within seven days, and throughout life?"

[The Buddha said:] "It is proper. Meat is [the medicine to be consumed] in the morning. After that, **fat of boiled [meat]** is [the medicine to be consumed] within seven days. After seven days, the burnt ash is [the medicine to be consumed] throughout life".

The *uddāna*, which encompasses the dialogue above, of the Tibetan version (Derge 'dul ba pa 223a4)

mdor na |

ruṅ ba dag daṅ 'dres pa daṅ ||

źag bdun du yaṅ bza' mi bya ||

tshil bu daṅ yaṅ de bźin te ||

bu ram śiṅ daṅ sṅa dror sbyar ||

Summary of Contents:

Things appropriate, mixed

For seven days, should not be consumed;

Also, **fat** is likewise,

Sugarcane, in the morning, suitable.

The S-V manuscript of the *Māṇavikā* 229r6

… m atyanta(rakāle) **māṃsaṃ pakvaṃ vasā** s(āptā) + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
… kāḥ || **evaṃ** …

[Upāli asked:] …

[The Buddha said:] "… then, **fat [from] boiled meat** is [the medicine to be consumed within] seven [days]. … **Likewise**, …

The *uddāna*, which encompasses the dialogue above, of the Sanskrit version (229r3)

uddānam* kalpikena sa(ṃ)sṛṣṭaṃ saptāhaṃ c(a) abhakṣikaṃ **vasād api tilā** ikṣu‹ḥ›

kālikaṃ cāpi yojayet* || ✿ (||) …

Summary of Contents:

[§1.6.1] By appropriate, Mixed,

Seven days, Not to be eaten;

[§1.6.3] From fat as well as **Sesame seeds;**

[§1.6.2] Sugarcane is suitable in the morning.

The *Shisong lü* (T. 1435 [23] 405c7–9)[51]

胡麻是時藥，壓作油是七日藥，燒作灰是盡形藥。肉是時藥，煮取脂是七日藥，燒作灰是盡形藥。

[The Buddha said:] "**Sesame seeds** are the medicine to be consumed in the morning; when pressed into oil, they become the medicine to be consumed for seven days; when burned to ash, they are the medicine to be consumed throughout life. [Also,] meat is the medicine to be consumed in the morning; the fat extracted from boiling it becomes the medicine to be consumed for seven days; when burned to ash, it is the medicine to be consumed throughout life".

T. 1441 [23]

No counterpart

This example addresses whether a single substance can be processed into three different types of medicine. While the Tibetan version only includes meat that can become the three different kinds of medicine through specific processes, both the Sanskrit version and T. 1435 provide two examples: meat and sesame seed. Even if the Sanskrit word *tila* (sesame seed) is not confirmed in the question-and-answer between Upāli and the Buddha in the Sanskrit version due to the damage to the manuscript, its appearance might be inferred from the term Skt. *tilā* (sesame seed) in the *uddāna* that encompasses this dialogue. Also, the use of Skt. *evaṃ* (likewise) in the Buddha's answer implies the presence of another example following meat.[52]

This example suggests that the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha* may serve as a crucial instrument for scholars who aim to verify and comprehend the multiplicity of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*. A more detailed investigation of the textual relationship among the four sources, namely the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions of the *Uttaragrantha*, the *Shisong lü*, and the *Sapoduobu pini modeleqie*, drawing on a broader range of textual evidence, will be conducted in my future research.

5. Concluding Remarks

This article examines the rediscovery and re-evaluation of the *Uttaragrantha* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* by the new Sanskrit manuscript fragments, namely the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha*. The research on the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha* has marked a significant milestone in the study of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, providing a new insight into our comprehension of the monastic law codes. As of March 2024, the newly identified Sanskrit text of the *Uttaragrantha*, comprising 52 folios, corresponds to 86 folios in the Derge edition of the Tibetan *Uttaragrantha*. This material not only presents the monastic law code in its original language but also helps to overcome numerous challenges that have arisen due to the reliance on the limited materials existing only as translations in Tibetan and Chinese. Furthermore, this article attempts to show the role of the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha* in shedding light on the complex textual history and the potential multiplicity in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* traditions. It does so by introducing additional evidence that highlights the differences in sequence in the chapters of the *Uttaragrantha* and by exploring various relationships with related materials, contradicting the expectation that it would be close to the Tibetan translation of the *Uttaragrantha*. The folios that have been identified thus far constitute merely the initial phase, with the expectation of more identification in the near future. Further identification and analysis of the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha* will significantly expand the canonical corpus of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*. With the invaluable support provided by the new Sanskrit textual evidence, a more comprehensive examination of the *Uttaragrantha* with its related materials will be conducted by the present author.

Abbreviations

BLSF I	Seishi Karashima and Klaus Wille (2006), ed., *Buddhist Manuscripts from Central Asia*: The British Library Sanskrit Fragments, Vol. I, Tokyo.
BLSF II	Seishi Karashima and Klaus Wille (2009), ed., *Buddhist Manuscripts from Central Asia*: The British Library Sanskrit Fragments, Vol. II.1–2, Tokyo.
BLSF III	Seishi Karashima, Jundo Nagashima and Klaus Wille (2015), ed., *Buddhist Manuscripts from Centra Asia: The British Library Sanskrit Fragments, Vol. III.1–2*, Tokyo.
Negi	J.S. Negi, *Tibetan–Sanskrit Dictionary*. Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1993.
SHT	Ernst Waldschmidt et al. (1965–2017), ed., *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*, (VOHD X), Wiesbaden/Stuttgart.

Notes

[1] This classification into four main divisions is based on the Indian tradition. The Sanskrit title "*Vinayottaragrantha*" is a compound formed by combining "*Vinaya*" and "*Uttaragrantha*", reconstructed from the Tibetan title. Given the Tibetan title *'Dul ba gźuṅ dam pa*, it may also have been called "*Uttamagrantha*" (with Tib. dam pa, meaning "excellent" and "good", equivalent to Skt. uttama; Tib. gźuṅ, meaning "recitation", equivalent to Skt. *grantha*, cf. Vogel 1985, p. 110, fn. 60). The *Vinayottaragrantha* (hereafter the *Uttaragrantha*) has been primarily known in Tibetan traditions and referenced in early Tibetan texts, suggesting its collective use for specific texts may have emerged only after the seventh century C.E. (cf. Kishino 2013, pp. 30–35). In the Tibetan tradition, eight *Vinaya* texts are enumerated: the *Vinayavastu*, the *Prātimokṣasūtra*, the *Vinayavibhaṅga*, the *Bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣasūtra*, the *Bhikṣuṇīvinayavibhaṅga*, the *Vinayakṣudrakavastu*, and the two *Vinayottaragrantha*s. The sequence of the eight texts is not consistent among all editions of the Kanjur. Notably, the placement of the *Vinayakṣudraka* differs. Cf. (Lee, forthcoming, p. 33, fn.37).

[2] Schopen (2004, pp. 124–25) noted that it contains unique content and specific rules not found elsewhere in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, such as monastery practices and detailed auction rules for a deceased monk's estate, indicating its importance beyond an auxiliary text.

[3] On the view that the three sections of the Pāli *Vinaya*—the *Suttavibhaṅga*, the *Khandhaka*, and the *Parivāra*—correspond, respectively, to the *Vinayavibhaṅga*, the Seventeen *Vastus* and the *Kṣudrakavastu*, and the *Uttaragrantha* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, see (Banerjee 1957, pp. 28–29; Yuyama 1979, pp. 32–33, and Prebish 1994, pp. 1–2).

[4] For more details on the two *Uttaragrantha*s, see (Kishino 2013, pp. 28–29). The incomplete version of the *Uttaragrantha*, the *'Dul ba gźuṅ bla ma*, only includes a single chapter, i.e., the incomplete *Upāliparipṛcchā*. For a comparison and historical background of the *Upāliparipṛcchā* included in the two *Uttaragrantha*s, see (Kishino 2013, pp. 30–31, fn.26).

[5] The reasons for the existence of two versions are not extensively documented. Yet, a hint emerges from the colophon of the incomplete *Uttaragrantha*. In both the Derge and Peking editions, there is an extended quotation from the colophon of the commentary of the text, the *Vinayottarāgamaviśeṣāgamapraśnavṛtti*. This quotation sheds light on the incomplete state of preservation of the *'Dul ba gźuṅ bla ma*. The commentary notes that following the persecution of Buddhism by the Shunga ruler Puṣyamitra, a full version of the *Uttaragrantha* became unavailable in Mathurā. Consequently, only an incomplete rendition, remembered by a monk from Kashmir, survived. This fragmentary version is referred to as the Kashmiri *Upāliparipṛcchā* in its section colophons (Clarke 2015, p. 77). For further details about the colophon of the *Uttaragrantha*, see (Kishino 2016, pp. 22–23, fn. 72 and 29, fn. 20).

[6] The colophon of the complete *Uttaragrantha* is present in the Derge and Peking Kanjur but is absent from the sTog Palace Kanjur and the Narthang Kanjur. Therefore, it is likely that the colophon was appended by Tibetan monks. This colophon includes verses that reference the individual chapters of the *Uttaragrantha* (Kishino 2016, pp. 22–23, fn. 72; for the verses, see Derge Pa 310b3; Peking Phe 293b4–5).

[7] Regarding the succinct descriptions and a structural analysis of the *Uttaragrantha* with a comparative table of the major sections of the Sarvāstivādin/Mūlasarvāstivādin *Uttaragrantha*s, see (Clarke 2015, pp. 77–80, 82).

[8] Yijing also translated the *Genben shuo yiqie youbu nituona mudejia shesong* (根本說一切有部尼陀那目得迦攝頌, T. 1456), a compilation of *uddānas* and *piṇḍoddānas* from both the *Nidāna* and *Muktaka*, in 710 CE.

[9] Dhammadinnā (2020) coined the term "Greater Sarvāstivāda", referring to a broad and encompassing tradition that includes the multiplicity of both the Sarvāstivāda and Mūlasarvāstivāda schools within its scope. "Greater Sarvāstivāda" is a concept used to acknowledge the complexity and diversity within these related traditions, which are distinct but share a wider denominational and ideological umbrella. This article will not attempt to further explain the relationship between the Sarvāstivāda and the Mūlasarvāstivāda. For an exploration to clarify the relationship between the terms Sarvāstivāda and Mūlasarvāstivāda, see (Lee, forthcoming, 1.2. Relationships between the terms Sarvāstivāda and Mūlasarvāstivāda).

[10] Regarding the succinct descriptions and a structural analysis on the Recitations 8–10 of the *Shisong lü*, see (Clarke 2015, pp. 71–72).

¹¹ The *piṇḍoddāna* serves as a summary of the verse summaries, encapsulating the essence of the *uddāna*s in a condensed form. These *uddāna*s may contain varying counts of keywords or key phrases. For the functions and importance of the *uddāna*s in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, see Panglung (1980). While the Tibetan version and Sanskrit version, which this present study introduces in the following, employ the *piṇḍoddana* and *uddāna* system for thematic organization, the two Chinese texts, the *Sapoduobu pini modeleqie* and the *Shisong lü* do not follow this system.

¹² For more on the citations in the Tibetan translation of the commentaries, see (Kishino 2013, p. 33, fn. 30).

¹³ For more details of these fragments, all of which were identified by Shayne Clarke, see BLSF I: 119; BLSF II: 225; and BLSF II: 273–274, respectively.

¹⁴ These fragments were initially edited in Hoernle's (1916) work, and all but the first one were identified by Shayne Clarke. For details on fragments indexed in Or.15007/504, 15009/48, 15009/57, 15009/443, see BLSF III: 131, BLSF II: 123–124, BLSF II: 132, and BLSF III: 306–307, respectively. Or.15011/1 is not included in BLSF.

¹⁵ Further information on SHT V 1068 (the *Kathāvastu*) will be provided by (Clarke's forthcoming). See also SHT XI: 422. Regarding the fragments, SHT VIII 1943 (a section of the *Mātṛkā*, the *Pratisaṃyukta*) and SHT III 937 (the *Upāliparipṛcchā*), see SHT, XI: 434 and 419–420, respectively. For details on the fragment of the *Mutkaka*, SHT XII 7185, see SHT XII: 365–367. Cf. (Wille 2014: 193–195).

¹⁶ Subsequent research on the *Uttaragrantha* has greatly benefited from Dr. Wille's pioneering work, which includes his generous provision of access to foundational yet unpublished studies in *Uttaragrantha* research.

¹⁷ In addition to Dr. Wille's pioneering work, scholars individually conducted fundamental investigations on the available fragments of the *Uttaragrantha* (manuscript A), mainly from the Schøyen Collection, at that time. While these works were not published, they were extensively utilized within specialist circles. Specifically, Clarke and Yao identified fragments of the *Māṇavikā* based on the transliterations made by Wille. Clarke also identified fragments of the *Ekottarikā and *Pañcaka based on Wille's transliterations. Borgland and Melzer identified fragments of the *Ṣoḍaśaka and *Nidāna*. Subsequently, Lueritthikul identified fragments of the *Ekottarikā by preparing readings for the meeting held at PHI in 2019.

¹⁸ More details can be found on the PHI project website: https://www.philology.no/birchbark (accessed on 25 January 2024).

¹⁹ In his 2020a study, Shōno identified and transliterated the fragments, found the parallels in the Tibetan version of the *Uttaragrantha*, and provided the translations of the Tibetan parallels and reconstructed Sanskrit text.

²⁰ According to Hartmann and Wille (2014, p. 147), the script is similar to the manuscripts of the *Vinayavibhaṅga*, *Prātimokṣasūtra*, *Saṃyuktāgama*, and *Udānavarga* among the eight manuscripts found in the private collection, Virginia. According to the classification of Gilgit/Bamiyan Type II by Melzer (2014, p. 263), the script of the *Uttaragrantha* (manuscript B) is a typical Type A of Gilgit/Bamiyan Type II of which characteristics are rectangular and pointed, being represented by the Gilgit *Vinayavastu* and the *Dīrghāgama* manuscript.

²¹ Melzer (2014, p. 263) distinguished Gilgit/Bāmiyān Type II into two sub-groups according to calligraphic variants. Type B has a characteristically more fluid appearance than Type A. However, considering that the distinction between Type A and Type B appears in ligatures with -*y*-, the shape of -*y*- in ligatures of the *Uttaragrantha* manuscript is close to Type A (cf. Yao, forthcoming, 1.2.3. Script).

²² For a detailed explanation of the dating of the manuscript, see (Yao, forthcoming, 1.2.1. Radiocarbon Dating).

²³ See (Yao, forthcoming, 1.2.5. Folio Numbering and Combination with the Uttaragrantha).

²⁴ Exceptions to the nine-line format are occasionally found in the *Uttaragrantha* part. For example, in the *Māṇavikā* chapter, the verso of folio number 230 includes an extra line at the bottom. This line is distinguished by a slightly different writing style and spacing between letters. It is likely that the scribe added a missing part of the text, as indicated by an insertion mark 'x'. Such use of the mark 'x' is occasionally observed in the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha*. Furthermore, four folios identified as 243, 244, 245 (but, only recto), and 247 in the *Ekottarikā chapter exhibit a ten-line format, according to the identification as of March 2024. However, the verso of 243 contains an extra eleventh line, matching the style of the additional tenth line of the verso of 230 above. This additional line was intentionally added by the scribe to correct and supplement the text in the fifth line of the same folio.

²⁵ The location of the string hole, situated at 1/3 of the length from the left margin on the folio, is confirmed in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*. Although no folio remains in its full length, in certain parts, the number of *akṣara*s can be estimated based on the text from the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* in the Gilgit manuscript. Consequently, Yao determined that the string hole is located at 1/3 of the length from the left margin of the folio. However, we do not have any Sanskrit text of the *Uttaragrantha* except the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha*. Therefore, under the current circumstances, it is challenging to ascertain the precise location of the string hole in the *Uttaragrantha* part of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu-Uttaragrantha* manuscript. Nonetheless, according to some reconstructed folios of the *Māṇavikā* chapter (Lee, forthcoming, 3. Transliteration and reconstruction with images of the Sanskrit manuscript fragments), the string hole's location in the *Uttaragrantha* part appears to be similar to that in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* to some extent.

²⁶ The gender of the title *Vinītakā* has been accepted as masculine or neuter, the *Vinītaka*. However, as for the original title of the *Vinītakā*, whether the title is a feminine *Vinītakā* or a masculine or neuter *Vinītaka* is uncertain due to the colophon of the

Vinītakā chapter, *vinītakāḥ samāptā*, newly found in the Schøyen Collection (2627/2/54/4cB in 228r of the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha* manuscript).

27 For a detailed explanation of the physical sequence of folios of the manuscript as well as the connection between the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* and the *Uttaragrantha*, see (Yao, forthcoming, 1.1.6. Physical Sequence of Folios and 1.2.5. Folio Numbering and Combination with the Uttaragrantha).

28 Clarke (2016, pp. 56–67) demonstrated that the Sanskrit title underlying Tibetan *'Dul bar byed pa* is *Vinītaka* by comparing the Tibetan and the Chinese versions of the *Vinayasaṃgraha*. However, the question of the title's gender—whether it is masculine/neuter *Vinītaka* or feminine *Vinītakā*—remains open for further investigation. Cf. fn. 26 and (Yao forthcoming, p. 24, fn. 81).

29 The chart incorporates foundational but unpublished work by Wille and Yao, supplemented by my own additions and modifications. In a future study, I will include the locations of the Chinese materials of the *Uttaragrantha* as seen in the comparative table of the *Māṇavikā* materials in the following.

30 The same principle will be applied to the concordances for subsequent chapters.

31 For detailed research and an English translation of the *Māṇavikā* chapter, see (Lee, forthcoming).

32 Regarding the synoptic structure and summary of the *Māṇavikā* chapter, see (Lee, forthcoming, 1.5.2. Synoptic structure and contents of the Māṇavikā).

33 These fragments have enabled the restoration of images for all nine folios. See (Lee, forthcoming, 3. Transliterations and reconstruction with the images of the Sanskrit manuscript fragments).

34 Despite the attestations in Guṇaprabha's works, determining the gender of the title is challenging due to its appearance in inflected forms. Nonetheless, I suggest that the title *Māṇavikā* in the feminine form seems more valid based on evidence from the Tibetan and Chinese sources. For a discussion on the gender of the title, see (Lee, forthcoming, 1.5.1 The chapter title "Māṇavikā").

35 However, some parts of T. 1441 and T. 1435 do not align with those of the Sanskrit and Tibetan. For a detailed explanation of the discrepancies among the four texts, see (Lee, forthcoming, 2.4. Textual relationship of the four sources).

36 The part (408a17–25) does not correspond to other versions. Also, the part (408a25–b4) corresponds to 233v.

37 The Merv manuscript was discovered in 1966 near the Merv oasis close to Bairam-Ali city along with old coins and a statuette. The manuscript is written in Brāhmī script on birch bark folios and is dated from the post-Kushan period to as late as the 5th century based on the paleographical analysis. The manuscript is divided into three sections, one of which represents a compilation based on a *Vinaya* of the Sarvāstivāda. For the detailed description of the Merv manuscript, see (Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 1999, pp. 27–30). For the colophon containing the chapter title, see (von Hinüber 2017, p. 51). Cf. (Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 2000, pp. 14–15; Clarke 2001, pp. 90–91).

38 The chart includes works by Clarke, Borgland, and Lueritthikul, and is supplemented with my own additions and modifications, including new identifications.

39 For the Sanskrit title attested in the Merv manuscript, see (Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 2000, pp. 14–15; Clarke 2001, pp. 90–91; von Hinüber 2017, p. 51).

40 For the Sanskrit title attested in the Merv manuscript, see (von Hinüber 2017, p. 51). Cf. (Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 2000, pp. 14–15; Clarke 2001, pp. 90–91).

41 For detailed research and an English translation of the *Nidāna* chapter, see Kishino (2013).

42 A part of 289r, corresponding 103b7–104b6, is not found in Yijing's *Nidāna* (cf. Kishino 2013, pp. 211–13).

43 As in the previous part of 289r, Yijing's *Nidāna* does not include the parallel of 289v (104b7–105b4). Cf. (Kishino 2013, pp. 213–16).

44 Some parts of Recitation 10, which includes *Matṛkā–Vinītakā–Muktaka*, remain unidentified to any chapters of the *Uttaragrantha* in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*. Cf. fn. 10.

45 Although the term *zengyi* 增一 in the section title *pini zengyifa* 毘尼增一法 is the translation of the *Ekottarikā, the content of the first part of *pini zengyi fa* 毘尼增一法 corresponds to the *Nidāna* (Clarke 2015, p. 71).

46 The section *pini modeleqie zashi* 毘尼摩得勒伽雜事 (Chapter on Miscellanea of the *Vinayamātṛkā) contains the three sections, the *Vinītakā*, *Mātṛkā*, and the *Māṇavikā*.

47 The section *youboli wen bu* 優波離問部 consists of eleven subsections, the eleventh of which *wen zahi chu* 問雜事初 corresponds to the *Māṇavikā*.

48 For the term Tib. *dad pa* (Skt. *chanda*), related passages can be found in the *Māṇavikā* chapter as follows: Derge pa 230b7–231a3 (The S-V manuscript of the *Māṇavikā*: 234v1–2); Derge pa 231b3–5; Derge pa 231b5–6; Derge pa 231b7–232a2 (The S-V manuscript of the *Māṇavikā*: 235r2); Derge pa 232a2–3 (The S-V manuscript of the *Māṇavikā*: 235r3–4); Derge pa 232a7–b1 (The S-V manuscript of the *Māṇavikā*: 235r6); and Derge pa 232b2–3 (The S-V manuscript of the *Māṇavikā*: 235r8). The same usage of Tib. *dad pa* is found in the *Upāliparipṛcchā* chapter of the *Uttaragrantha*. Unfortunately, folios of the *Upāliparipṛcchā* are not found in the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha*. However, Tib. *dad pa* in the Tibetan version of the *Upāliparipṛcchā* suggests that its original Sanskrit term is likely *chanda* because the context of the *Upāliparipṛcchā* aligns with that of the *Māṇavikā*, the *Karmavastu*,

and the *Adhikaraṇavastu*. For instance, a passage of the *Upāliparpṛcchā* (Derge na 285a7–b2), containing Tib. *dad pa*, provides a similar description to that of Derge pa 230b7–231a3 mentioned above.

49 As examples, for related passages of the *Karmavastu* that appear to be referenced by the *Māṇavikā*, refer to the *Karmavastu* 288a5–8 for the Sanskrit version and Derge *'dul ba* ga 140a2–5 for the Tibetan version (cf. Lueritthikul 2019, pp. 146, 64–65, §44–45). For related passages of the *Adhikaraṇavastu*, see the *Adhikaraṇavastu* 339v8–9 and Derge ga 237b5–6 (cf. Borgland 2014b, pp. 52, 122, §83) and the *Adhikaraṇavastu* 341r6–7 and Derge *'dul ba* ga 240a2–3 (cf. Borgland 2014b, pp. 57, 127, §99).

50 This study will not attempt to explore variations in *Vinaya* terminology, instead leaving it open for exploration in future research. It seems that *Vinaya* technical terms used in the *Uttaragrantha* often differ from those listed in the glossaries in the *Mahāvyutpatti*. Hu-von Hinüber (1997a, 1997b) highlighted that the texts of the Tibetan Kanjur generally correspond to those of the Gilgit Sanskrit manuscripts. Conversely, *Mahavyutpatti*'s glossaries are more closely aligned with those found in early commentaries, such as the *Vinayasūtra* and *Vinayasūtravṛtti* by Guṇaprabha. This indicates the necessity for a comparative study of the *Vinaya* terminologies of the *Uttaragrantha* with the new Sanskrit material, the S-V manuscript of the *Uttaragrantha*. Such an investigation is planned for future research.

51 As previously noted in fn. 11, the *Shisong lü* does not utilize the *piṇḍoddāna* and *uddāna* system for thematic organization. Therefore, there is no *uddāna* available for comparison with the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions.

52 In the *uddāna* of the Tibetan version, Tib. *de bźin te* (likewise, thus) is present but does not correspond to Skt. *evaṃ* because *evaṃ* appears after the double *daṇḍa*—if the double *daṇḍa* is correctly placed—which concludes the sentence about the first example, meat, in the Buddha's answer in the dialogue of the Sanskrit version. Furthermore, in the Tibetan version's dialogue, which is complete and undamaged, no second item is mentioned that can be processed into three different types of medicines.

References

Banerjee, Anukul Chandra. 1957. *Sarvāstivāda Literature*. Calcutta: D. Banerjee.

Borgland, Jens Wilhelm. 2014a. A Study of the Adhikaraṇavastu: Legal Settlement Procedures of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Culture Studies and Oriental Languages, Faculty of Humanities, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway.

Borgland, Jens Wilhelm. 2014b. Draft Diplomatic Edition of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Adhikaraṇavastu—A New Reading of the Manuscript. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Culture Studies and Oriental Languages, Faculty of Humanities, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway.

Clarke, Shayne. 2001. The Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Muktaka 根本説一切有部目得迦. *Bukkyōkenkyū* 佛教研究 30: 81–107.

Clarke, Shayne. 2004. *Vinaya Mātṛkā*—Mother of the Monastic Codes, or just Another Set of Lists? A Response to Frauwallner's Handling of the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya. *Indo-Inranian Journal* 47: 77–120. [CrossRef]

Clarke, Shayne. 2015. Vinayas. In *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism*. Edited by Jonathan Silk. Leiden and Boston: Brill, vol. 1, pp. 60–87.

Clarke, Shayne. 2016. *The 'Dul bar byed pa* (*Vinītaka*) Case-Law Section of the Mūlasarvāstivādin *Uttaragrantha*: Sources for Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtra* and Indian Buddhist Attitudes towards Sex and Sexuality. *Journal of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies* 20: 47–194.

Clarke, Shayne. Forthcoming. Towards a Comparative Study of the *Sarvāstivāda-* and *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*s: Studies in the Structure of the *Uttaragrantha* (1): *Kathāvastu*—A Preliminary Survey.

Dhammadinnā, Bhikkhunī. 2020. Highlights from a Comparative Study of the *Saṃyukta-āgama* Quotations in the *Abhidharmakośopāyikā-ṭīkā*. In *Research on the Saṃyukta-āgama*. Edited by Dhammadinnā. Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation, vol. 8, pp. 481–590.

Hartmann, Jens-Uwe, and Klaus Wille. 2014. The Manuscript of the Dīrghāgama and the Private Collection in Virginia. In *From Birch Bark to Digital Data: Recent Advances in Buddhist Manuscript Research*. Edited by Paul Harrison and Jens-Uwe Hartmann. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, pp. 137–55.

Hirakawa, Akira. 1982. *Monastic Discipline for the Buddhist Nuns: An English Translation of the Chinese Text of the Mahāsāṅghika-Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*. Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.

Hoernle, A. F. Rudolf. 1916. *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan*. Oxford: Oxford U.P., vol. 1.

Hu-von Hinüber, Haiyan. 1997a. On the Sources of Some Entries in the Mahāvyutpatti: Contributions to Indo-Tibetan Lexicography I. In *Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur (II): Gustav Roth zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Edited by Heinz Bechert, Sven Bretfeld and Petra Kieffer-Pülz. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 183–99.

Hu-von Hinüber, Haiyan. 1997b. The 17 Titles of the Vinayavastu in the Mahāvyutpatti: Contributions to Indo-Tibetan Lexicography II. In *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Edited by Petra Kieffer-Pülz and Jens-Uwe Hartmann. Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica, vol. 30, pp. 339–45.

Kishino, Ryoji. 2008. 『薩婆多部毘尼摩得勒迦』は『十誦律』の注釈書か? 印度学仏教学研究 56: 183–86.

Kishino, Ryoji. 2013. A Study of the *Nidāna*: An Underrated Canonical Text of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda*-vinaya. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, CA, USA.

Kishino, Ryoji. 2016. A Further Study of the *Muktaka* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*: A Table of Contents and Parallels. 佛教大学仏教学会紀要 21: 227–83.

Lee, Hyebin. Forthcoming. A Study of the Māṇavikā Chapter in the Uttaragrantha with Newly Identified Sanskrit Fragments. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Culture Studies and Oriental Languages, Faculty of Humanities, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway.

Lueritthikul, Phra Weerachai. 2019. Exclusion as Penalty: Edition of the Gilgit Versions of the Karmavastu, Pudgalavastu and Pārivāsikavastu of the Mūlasarvāstivāda. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Culture Studies and Oriental Languages, Faculty of Humanities, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway.

Melzer, Gudrun. 2014. A Palaeographic Study of a Buddhist Manuscript from the Gilgit Region: A Glimpse into a Scribes' Workshop. In *Manuscript Cultures: Mapping the Field 1*. Edited by Jörg Quenzer, Dmitry Bondarev and Jan-Ulrich Sobisch. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 227–73.

Panglung, Jampa Losang. 1980. Preliminary Remarks on the *Uddānas* in the Vinaya of the *Mūlasarvāstivādin*. In *Tibetan Studies in Honour of Hugh Richardson*. Bangkok: Orchid Press Publishing Limited, pp. 226–32.

Prebish, Charles S. 1994. *A Survey of Vinaya Literature*. London: Routledge.

Salomon, Richard. 2006. Recent Discoveries of Early Buddhist Manuscripts: And Their Implications for the History of Buddhist Texts and Canons. In *Between the Empires: Society in India 300 BCE to 400 CE*. Edited by Patrick Olivelle. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 349–82.

Schopen, Gregory. 2000. Hierarchy and Housing in a Buddhist Monastic Code. A Translation of the Sanskrit Text of the *Śayanāsanavastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya*. Part One. *Buddhist Literature* 2: 92–196.

Schopen, Gregory. 2004. *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Shōno, Masanori. 2020a. Sanskrit Fragments from Prātideśanikā 2–4 of the *Upāliparipṛcchā* in the *Vinaya-uttaragrantha*. *Bulletin of the International Institute for Buddhist Studies* 3: 91–120.

Shōno, Masanori. 2020b. Sanskrit Fragments of Pāyattikā 6 of the *Vinayavibhaṅga* Belonging to the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya. *Journal of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies* 24: 27–70.

Shōno, Masanori. 2021. Sanskrit Fragments from Naissargikā Pāyattikā 2 of the *Vinayavibhaṅga* Belonging to the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya*. *Bulletin of the International Institute for Buddhist Studies* 4: 33–70.

Vogel, Claus. 1985. Bu-Ston on the Schism of the Buddhist Church and on the Doctrinal Tendencies of Buddhist Scripture. In *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*. Edited by Heinz Bechert. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 104–10.

von Hinüber, Oskar. 2017. On the Early History of Indic Buddhist Colophons. *International Journal of Buddhist Thought and Culture* 27: 45–72. [CrossRef]

Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, M. I. 1999. A Sanskrit Manuscript on Birch-Bark From Bairam-Ali: I: The *Vinaya* of the Sarvāstivādins (Part 5). *Manuscripta Orientalia. International Journal for Oriental Manuscript Research* 5: 27–36.

Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, M. I. 2000. A Sanskrit Manuscript on Birch-Bark from Bairam-Ali: I: The *Vinaya* of the Sarvāstivādins. *Manuscripta Orientalia. International Journal for Oriental Manuscript Research* 6: 10–16.

Wille, Klaus. 2014. Sanskrit Manuscript in the Turfan Collection (Berlin). In *From Birch Bark to Digital Data: Recent Advances in Buddhist Manuscript Research*. Edited by Paul Harrison and Jens-Uwe Hartmann. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, pp. 187–211.

Yao, Fumi. Forthcoming. The *Bhaiṣajyavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*. In *Buddhist Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection*. Oslo: Hermes Publishing, vol. VI.

Yuyama, Akira. 1979. *Systematische Übersicht über die buddhistische Sanskrit-Literatur. A Systematic Survey of Buddhist Sanskrit Literature*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, vol. I.