

The Consumption of Garlic: Vinaya Rules*

Ann Heirman

Professor, Department of Chinese Language and Culture, Ghent University

Abstract

In the early centuries of the development of Buddhism, monastic leaders compiled large anthologies of disciplinary texts or guidelines, commonly called vinaya. Thereafter, Buddhist monasticism gradually spread across the Asian continent, and the guidelines were translated in many languages. These texts now constitute a rich source of information about the practices, ideas and attitudes that were essential elements in the proper functioning of Buddhist monastic communities. In this paper, six vinaya fragments have been translated. They all discuss the ban of garlic in a monastic environment. The translations not only demonstrate the characteristic step-by-step structure of medieval monastic guidelines, but also reveal why restrictions on the use of garlic became a key identity marker of China's Buddhists.

Garlic is more than just a vegetable; due to its disagreeable smell, it is a symbol of uncleanness and lack of respect. On the other hand, it is prescribed as an effective medicine, which testifies to the significance of medical care in Buddhist monasticism. And, finally, the illustrative stories that accompany the precepts provide a window onto the Buddhist establishment's attitudes towards its male and female devotees.

Keywords:

vinaya, monastery, *bhikṣu*, *bhikṣuṇī*, garlic

* I am grateful to Chiu Tzu-Lung, Chung Jin-il, Faling, Natasha Heller, Claire Maes, Albert Welter, Stuart Young, and the anonymous reviewers at JCBS for offering many useful suggestions for improvement.

戒律中之（禁）食用大蒜

Ann Heirman

比利時根特大學中國語言與文化學系教授

摘要

當佛教在公元世紀初的發展時期，長老比丘們編纂了大量的紀律準則之文本，通稱為戒律。因此隨著佛教修行制度傳遍至亞洲版圖，戒律文本亦被翻譯成不同語言。於修道實踐、思想和態度層面而言，如今戒本已構成了佛教僧團運作所依恃參考之要素。此論文從戒律中擇譯六個案例，皆是探討有關僧團禁用大蒜之議題。此研究不僅欲展示出中古時期戒條之特色結構，亦揭示禁食用大蒜的限制為漢傳佛門眾之身分標記。

由於刺鼻難聞氣味，大蒜不僅只作為蔬菜，亦是不潔與不敬之象徵。然而，其本身具有醫療功效可用於僧團中之照護面上。最後，我們可發現在與戒律相應之佛典故事中呈現出佛教對待男女眾之（區別）態度。

關鍵詞：

戒律、僧團、比丘、苾芻、比丘尼、苾芻尼、大蒜

As is well known, the Buddhist community developed in India a few centuries before the start of the Common Era. In these early centuries, monastic leaders compiled large anthologies of disciplinary texts or guidelines, commonly called vinaya. Thereafter, Buddhist monasticism continued to attract new recruits who gradually dispersed across the Asian continent, taking the guidelines with them. These texts now constitute a rich source of information about the practices, ideas and attitudes that were essential elements in the proper functioning of Buddhist monastic communities. Nevertheless, a degree of caution should be exercised when analyzing vinaya texts because they were written with the very specific aim of guiding Buddhist practitioners towards ideal behavior. As such, they should be treated as a set of normative guidelines, rather than evidence of how Buddhist monks and nuns actually behaved in their day-to-day lives. Nevertheless, the tools and practices mentioned in the texts were at least imaginable—and must have been known—to Buddhist followers who read the vinayas or heard them recited.¹

The translations of six vinaya fragments in this paper not only demonstrate the characteristic step-by-step structure of medieval monastic guidelines but also reveal why the ban on garlic became a key identity marker of Buddhists in China.

The core texts of vinaya monastic discipline are two lists of rules (*prātimokṣas*) and a set of formal procedures governing the actions of the monastic community as an institution (*karmavācanā*).² The two *prātimokṣas*—one for monks (*bhikṣus*) and one for nuns (*bhikṣuṇīs*)—should be recited every fortnight during a ceremony. It is important to note that these rules are not based on a sole exposition; rather, they are presented as having been formulated gradually, in response to each occasion when the behavior or attitude of a particular monk or nun was considered to be incorrect or improper. This process continued long after the demise of the Buddha, until, at a certain point around the first centuries of the Common Era, the lists of rules were finalized.³ Crucially, however, throughout the history of the Buddhist tradition, all of the regulations have been attributed to the Buddha himself.

Numerous rules (and, often, different interpretations of rules) had already emerged in early Buddhism, so various traditions, each defined by its own

¹ For further discussion of the use of vinaya texts in the study of Buddhist monasticism and material culture, see, among others, Clarke, “Monks Who Have Sex,” 35–39, and Heirman and Torck, *A Pure Mind in a Clean Body*, 3–17.

² Sanskrit has been used for all Indic terms.

³ See, among others, von Hinüber, *Das Pātimokkhasutta*, 89–91.

vinaya, came into being.⁴ These vinayas were broadly similar, although there were some notable differences in terms of their insistence on, interpretation of and attitudes towards particular practices. The several *prātimokṣas* that are recited at the aforementioned ceremony and accepted by every new monastic during his or her ordination ceremony serve as a bond among the members of that particular vinaya tradition. Although some Chinese texts, such as early biographies and catalogues, suggest that various traditions' *prātimokṣa* texts started to reach China in the third century CE, the first clear evidence of vinaya texts in the region dates from the mid to late fourth century.⁵

The *prātimokṣa* rules are introduced and discussed in detail in explanatory chapters for monks and nuns known as *bhikṣu-* and *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅgas*, respectively. *Karmavācanā* procedures, on the other hand, are explained in detail in chapters, that are referred to with a variety of terms, such as *khandhakas* (Pāli), *vastus* (Sanskrit), and others.⁶ In addition to expositions on ceremonies, these chapters contain myriad short guidelines on many aspects of daily monastic life, including the consumption of foodstuffs such as garlic, as discussed in the translations below. Each tradition's collection of *bhikṣu-* and *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅgas*, plus the accompanying chapters, constitute what is generally called a full vinaya.

Six full vinayas survive to the present day. Four of them survive only in Chinese translation, and a fifth exists in Chinese translation as well as in Sanskrit and Tibetan versions. In addition, the so-called Pāli vinaya is extant only in the Pāli language. In chronological order of translation, the five Chinese vinayas are: the *Shisong lü* 十誦律 (T 1435, 23; Sarvāstivāda vinaya); the *Sifen lü* 四分律 (T 1428, 22; Dharmaguptaka vinaya); the *Mohesengqi lü* 摩訶僧祇律 (T 1425, 22; Mahāsāṃghika vinaya); the *Mishasai bu hexi wufen lü* 彌沙塞部和醯五分律 (T 1421, 22; Mahīśāsaka vinaya); and the *Genbenshuoyiqieyou bu pinaiye* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶 (T 1442–1451, 23–24), Yijing's 義淨 (635–713) translation of large parts of the Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya.⁷ The first four of these vinayas were translated in

⁴ For a detailed overview of the evolution and spread of early Buddhist schools, see Kieffer-Pülz, "Die buddhistische Gemeinde," 285–302. For an overview of vinaya texts, see Clarke, "Vinayas."

⁵ For more details on the first vinaya texts in China, see, among others, Funayama, "The Acceptance of Buddhist Precepts," 97–104.

⁶ For an overview, see Clarke, "Vinayas," 66.

⁷ A Tibetan translation of the Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya and many Sanskrit sections are also extant. For details, see Yuyama, *Systematische Übersicht über die buddhistische Sanskrit-Literatur*, 12–33; Clarke, "Vinayas," 73–81.

the fifth century CE, whereas Yijing translated the fifth at the beginning of the eighth century. By then, however, a number of influential Buddhist masters had already started to promote the Dharmaguptaka vinaya (*Sifen lü*), and it remained the principal reference point for monastic discipline in China.⁸ In light of this, I have used the Dharmaguptaka vinaya as my main source of reference, supplemented with corresponding extracts from the relatively analogous *Mishasai bu hexi wufen lü* and the more distinct *Genbenshuoyiqieyou bu pinaiye*.⁹ Overall, the latter text is considerably longer than the other full vinayas, as it includes a wealth of stories.

The fragments chosen for translation in this paper present guidelines on a particular aspect of the monastic diet—namely, the consumption of garlic.¹⁰ As is widely known, all of the vinayas contain dietary recommendations, with the most famous arguably being the restrictions imposed on the consumption of meat and fish. Although there is no outright prohibition against eating these products, monastics must not see, hear or suspect that the animal was killed for the specific purpose of being offered to them as food.¹¹ That said, over time, Chinese monastics have gradually adopted a more stringent approach, to such an extent that they are now fully vegetarian.¹² Chinese monastics also avoid alcohol, garlic and other pungent plants, such as onions.¹³ Indeed, this strict diet has become one of the main signifiers of Buddhist identity in China.

⁸ See, among others, Heirman, “Vinaya from India to China,” 192–195; Zou, *The Life of Daoxuan*, 188–207.

⁹ There are also parallel passages in the other vinayas, although these are not included in this paper. A more comprehensive study of the consumption of garlic and other pungent plants—including full comparisons across the various traditions and references—would certainly aid our understanding of Buddhist dietary prescriptions and proscriptions.

¹⁰ For further discussion on the use of garlic in Buddhism, see, among others, Heirman and De Rauw, “Offenders, Sinners and Criminals,” 61–62, 64–71; Kieschnick, “Buddhist Vegetarianism in China,” 191–192; Schmithausen, *The Problem of the Sentience of Plants*, 43–46.

¹¹ In addition, there are specific restrictions on certain types of meat, including elephant, horse and dog. For a detailed study on vegetarianism in Indian Buddhism, see Schmithausen, *Fleischverzehr und Vegetarismus*.

¹² For a discussion on the growth of vegetarianism in Chinese Buddhism, see, in particular, Kieschnick, “Buddhist Vegetarianism in China.”

¹³ Buddhist texts often refer to ‘five pungent plants’ (*wu xin* 五辛), although they have differing views on what these five plants might be. That said, Chinese sources invariably include garlic, onions and leeks (see Heirman and De Rauw, “Offenders, Sinners and Criminals,” 64; Kieschnick, “Buddhist Vegetarianism in China,” 192).

The main reason why the vinayas caution against the consumption of garlic is its disagreeable smell, which is linked to uncleanness and to a lack of respect for fellow monastics, the Buddha and the Dharma. Nevertheless, garlic is recommended as an effective treatment for a number of diseases.¹⁴ As Pierce Salguero has pointed out, knowledge of health and disease has been a central component of Buddhist thought since the very beginning. In China, countless translators and Buddhist masters undertook the major task of translating this medical knowledge into Chinese and disseminating it to their readers. Consequently, Buddhist monastics eventually became some of China's most active healthcare practitioners.¹⁵

One particularly intriguing aspect of the vinaya guidelines on garlic is that they are highly gender-specific. As such, they provide valuable insights into the authors' and compilers' contrasting attitudes towards men and women.¹⁶ For instance, the precepts for monks, which focus on the odor that permeates after eating garlic, are located in the chapter sections of the three vinayas. By contrast, the nuns' instructions form part of each vinaya's *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga*, in which the *prātimokṣa* rules are explained. Each *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga* rule is prefaced with an introductory story that sets the context in which the rule was supposedly stipulated, although most of them were likely added after the rules themselves were formulated.¹⁷ This gives the *vinaya* lawmakers the opportunity to give a rationale for the establishment of the subsequent precept. An enumeration of any exceptions or extenuating circumstances and finally, a word-for-word commentary follow the precept itself. The sections on garlic are notable for the inclusion of birth stories that explain why early nuns displayed a seemingly insatiable yearning for the pungent vegetable. Garlic-eating nuns are said to have committed a *pācittika/pāyantikā* (and variants) offense—that is, a moderate but still quite significant transgression. This category of offense encompasses unchaste behavior, a longing for luxury, false teaching and general

For a discussion on alcohol, see Heirman and De Rauw, “Offenders, Sinners and Criminals,” 60, 64–71.

¹⁴ See, for instance, Kleine, “Health Care in Indian Monasteries,” 154; Salguero, “Rules on Medicines from the *Five-Part Vinaya* of the Mahīśāsaka School.” For some introduction to healing (and even demonic) powers of garlic in ayurvedic medicine, see Wujastyk, *The Roots of Ayurveda*, 154–160.

¹⁵ Salguero, *Translating Buddhist Medicine*, 1–11.

¹⁶ For an introduction to this topic, see Hüsken, “Gender and Early Buddhist Monasticism.”

¹⁷ Here, I follow Oskar von Hinüber's appraisal of the development of the vinaya texts (see *Das Pātimokkhasutta*, 83).

troublemaking. The offender is obliged to confess, after which some form of institutional punishment will be imposed.¹⁸ The consequences for monks who eat garlic are less severe. They are said to have committed merely “a bad deed” (*duṣkṛta*)—a minor offense that incurs few penalties.¹⁹ This contrast in the treatment of monks and nuns for identical misdemeanors exemplifies a recurring theme of negativity towards womanhood throughout the vinaya texts. Indeed, the ban on garlic is justified, in typically negative fashion, with direct reference to the irresponsible behavior of greedy women. Nevertheless, as Bhikkhunī Dhammadinnā and Amy Paris Langenberg have both demonstrated, the vinayas also contain early evidence of a growing respect for women and their contributions to the Buddhist community, for instance, through their roles as teachers and leaders of nunneries.²⁰

The six fragments illustrate two important aspects of vinaya texts. First, they shed light on the highly detailed technicality of Buddhist legal organization within well-established monastic communities. Second, they provide insights into how certain disciplinary issues eventually evolved into essential Buddhist monastic characteristics. In addition, they demonstrate the richness of vinaya material in the study of material culture. Garlic is more than just a vegetable; due to its disagreeable smell, it is a symbol of uncleanness and lack of respect. On the other hand, it is prescribed as an effective medicine, which attests to the significance of medical care in Buddhist monasticism. Finally, the illustrative stories that accompany the precepts provide a window into the Buddhist establishment’s attitudes towards its male and female devotees. In sum, the study of vinaya texts—and, in this example, their detailed rules regarding a particular foodstuff—is a rewarding experience that enhances our understanding of the development of Buddhist communities and conventions.

¹⁸ For an overview of the offenses listed in the *prātimokṣa*, see, among others, Heirman, *Rules for Nuns*, Part I, 117–211 (esp. 141–147 for a discussion of the *pācittika/pāyantikā* offenses).

¹⁹ In the Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya, a monk is said to commit a *yue fa zui* 越法罪 (*sātisāra*, lit. “a transgression of the teaching”)—a minor offense that in this context seems to equate to a *duṣkṛta* in the other vinayas (see Chung, *Die Pravāraṇā*, 92, note 253; Hu-von Hinüber, *Das Poṣadhavastu*, 234–238).

²⁰ Dhammadinnā, “The Funeral of Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī”; Langenberg, “*Mahāsāṅghika-Lokottaravāda Bhikṣuṇī Vinaya*”; Langenberg, *Birth in Buddhism*, which includes a very interesting reflection on the female Buddhist ascetic (153–178). For information on nuns’ contributions to medical practice and teaching, see Langenberg, “Nuns, Laywomen, and Healing” and “Female Monastic Healing and Midwifery.” The vinayas explicitly prohibit nuns from providing medical assistance, but this did not stop nuns of assisting (lay)women with medical needs.

Six vinaya fragments on the consumption of garlic for monks and nuns

1. Rules for monks

1.1. Dharmaguptaka vinaya (T 1428, 22: 956b14–19)

At that time, the World-Honored One was staying in the Jetavana grove [in Anāthapiṇḍada's park].²¹ Surrounded by an immeasurable crowd, he was teaching the Dharma [to them]. Then, there was a *bhikṣu* who had eaten garlic, standing far away from the Buddha. Knowing this, the World-Honored One asked Ānanda:²² “Why does this *bhikṣu* stand so far away?” Ānanda said: “This *bhikṣu* has eaten garlic.” The Buddha said to Ānanda: “How could someone desire this taste and not listen to the Dharma? From now on, one should not eat garlic at all.”

Then Śāriputra became ill, suffering from wind [disease].²³ The doctor told him to take garlic. The Buddha said: “I allow him to take it.”

爾時世尊在祇桓園中。與無數百千衆圍遶說法。時有比丘噉蒜遠佛住。時世尊知而故問阿難。此比丘何故遠住。阿難言。此比丘噉蒜。佛言阿難。寧可貪如是味而不聽法耶。自今已去。一切不應噉蒜。

爾時舍利弗病風。醫教服蒜。佛言聽服。

1.2. Mahīśāsaka vinaya (T 1421, 22: 176a11–26)

At that time, *bhikṣus* ate raw and cooked garlic, before and after [noon]. There was no time they did not eat it. Some also ate it plain, and their rooms were foul-smelling. When lay followers entered the room and smelled the odor, they criticized [the monks]: “The garlic odor of these *śramaṇas*' residence is just like that of a kitchen.”²⁴

²¹ On this place and its Chinese name, see Heirman, *Rules for Nuns*, Part II, 294–295, note 121.

²² Ānanda and Śāriputra (mentioned below) are two of the Buddha's chief disciples.

²³ Diseases linked to wind are generally defined as problems related to anything that circulates in the body. See Heirman and Torck, *A Pure Mind in a Clean Body*, 57–58.

²⁴ A *śramaṇa* (Chinese 沙門) is a renunciant, and in this context a member of the Buddhist community.

When the *bhikṣus* reported this to the Buddha, the Buddha said: “To eat garlic without a reason is not permitted. When there is a reason to eat garlic, one should not walk or stand upwind from other *bhikṣus*.”

When a *bhikṣu* consumed garlic for some minor reason, he did not dare attend the Tathāgata’s²⁵ lecture. The Buddha asked: “Why do you not attend the lecture?” He answered: “The World-Honored One does not allow us to walk or stand upwind from other *bhikṣus* when we eat garlic. Therefore, I did not dare do so.” The Buddha rebuked this *bhikṣu* in many ways: “You are a stupid person. What you are doing goes against the teaching. Hankering for smelly food, you lose the immeasurable benefits of the teaching’s flavor.” Having rebuked him, he announced to [all] *bhikṣus*: “From now on, one is not permitted to consume garlic for minor reasons. Anyone who violates it [commits] a *duṣkṛta*. The *bhikṣus* who eat garlic have to treat the other *bhikṣus* respectfully. Respectfully means not being allowed to enter a warm room,²⁶ a lecture hall, a dining room, a bathhouse, a toilet, another person’s room, a village or a *stūpa* (pagoda) for seven days [after consuming the garlic]. After seven days, one should shake out one’s bedding that needs to be shaken, wash [the bedding] that needs to be washed, expose to the sun [the bedding] that needs to be exposed to the sun, and perfume [the bedding] that needs to be perfumed.²⁷ One should sweep one’s room and spread mud about the interior [to clean the room].²⁸ One should wash one’s clothes and wash oneself. After that, one may enter [the communal areas] again.”

時諸比丘噉生熟蒜。前食後食無時不噉。亦空噉之房舍臭處。諸白衣入房聞臭譏呵言。此諸沙門住處蒜臭猶如庖厨。

諸比丘以是白佛。佛言。不聽無因緣噉蒜。若有因緣噉時。不得在諸比丘上風行立。

²⁵ Tathāgata (Chinese 如來), one of the Buddha’s epithets, literally means “one who has thus come/gone.” There are several interpretations of the term, but one of the most common is that the Buddha has come and gone like previous Buddhas. See Buswell and Lopez, *Dictionary of Buddhism*, 897.

²⁶ A warm room is a room where fire is made, close to a kitchen or a bathing room. See Heirman and Torck, *A Pure Mind in a Clean Body*, 33.

²⁷ For details on how to wash monastic robes (and so presumably also bedding), see Heirman, “Washing and Dyeing,” 472–474. After washing the robes, one should expose them to the sun to dry.

²⁸ In India, the use of cow dung to clean a room was not uncommon (see, for instance, Leslie, *The Perfect Wife*, 59–61). For the Chinese translators, this must have felt as odd or even unclean, so they translated it as *ni* 泥, ‘mud’.

有一比丘以小因緣噉蒜。如來說法不敢往聽。佛問。何故不來聽法。答言。世尊。不聽噉蒜在諸比丘上風行立。是以不敢。佛種種呵責彼比丘。汝愚癡人所作非法。貪食臭穢失於無量法味之利。呵已告諸比丘。從今不聽以小因緣噉蒜。犯者突吉羅。噉蒜比丘應正順諸比丘。正順者。七日不得入溫室講堂食堂浴室廁上他房聚落塔邊過。七日後。臥具應抖擻者抖擻應浣者浣。應曬者曬。應香熏者香熏。灑掃房中遍泥其內。自浣衣服洗浴身體。然後入。

1.3. *Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya* (T 1451, 24: 230a6–b22)

At the time, there was a *bhikṣu* who, after eating garlic, went to where the Buddha was, bowed to the Buddha's feet and stood to one side. The Buddha said: "Sit, *bhikṣu*, concentrate, and listen to me teaching the Dharma." After the *bhikṣu* heard the Buddha's instructions, he again prostrated to the World-Honored One and then sat to one side. The Buddha taught him the Dharma. While [the *bhikṣu*] was listening to the Dharma, he turned his face away several times. He was afraid that the bad smell might lightly touch [the Buddha's] venerable body. This happened three times. The Buddha said: "*Bhikṣu*, you should concentrate and listen to what I am teaching." The *bhikṣu* then again turned his face away three times. He bowed to the Buddha's feet, respectfully took his leave, and went away.

The World-Honored One, [even though] knowing [what had happened], asked: "Ānanda, why did that *bhikṣu* turn his face away several times while listening to the Dharma?" Ānanda said: "He had eaten garlic and was afraid that it would touch [the Buddha's] venerable body. Therefore, he turned his face away several times." The Buddha said to Ānanda: "Are there *bhikṣus* who eat garlic?" Ānanda said: "There are." The Buddha said: "Eating garlic prevents them from entering the noble path. In the past those who did not eat garlic, having listened to my Dharma teaching, [were able to then] destroy the big mountain of the twenty [wrong] kinds of view of the self²⁹ with the diamond pounder (*vajra*) of wisdom, and attained the stream-enterer stage.³⁰ Therefore,

²⁹ [You] *shen jian* [有] 身見 (*satkāyadṛṣṭi*, "[wrong] view of the self") is the incorrect view that the impermanent components of the body are real and constitute a "self." This erroneous view is permanently eradicated by attaining the stream-enterer stage (see below). See Buswell and Lopez, *Dictionary of Buddhism*, 787. On the twenty views, see also Muller, *Digital Dictionary*, s.v. *er shi zhong shen jian* 二十種身見, last accessed September 6, 2020.

³⁰ *Yu liu guo* 預流果 (*srotaāpatti-phala*, "the stream-enterer stage") is the first of four stages that lead to enlightenment in mainstream Buddhism. See Buswell and Lopez, *Dictionary of Buddhism*, 854.

Ānanda, from now on, I stipulate that *bhikṣus* should not eat garlic, nor onions or leeks. Those who eat it commit a transgression (*sātisāra*).”

At the time, Śāriputra was sitting among the assembly of monks and thought: “At present, this *bhikṣu* cannot see the truth [and become awakened]. Will he see the truth tomorrow?” Following this, he investigated, and the next day, again, there were no means for [the *bhikṣu*] to see the truth. Then [Śāriputra] entered the fourth level of concentration³¹ and investigated [the *bhikṣu*’s] future, but still did not see the day when he would attain enlightenment. Then [Śāriputra] emerged from his meditation and spoke a verse (*gāthā*):

Because of having scattered thoughts and being unconcentrated for this short time, [this *bhikṣu*] will not see the ultimate truth [and become enlightened] in the future.

At that time, the World-Honored One knew what Śāriputra was thinking, and said to him: “Śāriputra, even though you have not yet reached the level of attainment of the buddhas, you rashly think such things. This matter is something beyond [the understanding of those] at the level of attainment of adepts (*śrāvaka*)³² and solitary buddhas (*pratyekabuddha*).³³ In the future a buddha will appear in the world, named ‘Honored by All.’ Under the tutelage of this buddha, this person will become a monk, cultivate religious practice, annihilate all the defilements, and attain the fruit of arhatship.”

The Buddha then thought: “Because this *bhikṣu* ate garlic, he was prevented from seeing the truth. Therefore, *bhikṣus* should not eat garlic. Those who eat it commit a transgression.”

Then, there was a *bhikṣu* whose body was afflicted with a disease. He went to see a doctor and said: “Honored sir, I have this kind of illness. Please give me a remedy.” [The doctor] said: “Holy one, you can take garlic and this illness will disappear.” He declared: “Honored sir, the Buddha does not allow the eating [of garlic].” The doctor said: “This is the medicine for this disease. Nothing else will cure it.” The *bhikṣu* related this to the Buddha, and the Buddha

³¹ The fourth *dhyāna* is a level of contemplation when the mind becomes indifferent to pleasure and pain. See Muller, *Digital Dictionary*, s.v. *di si chan* 第四禪, last accessed September 6, 2020.

³² A *sheng wen* 聲聞 (*śrāvaka*, lit. “listener”) is a direct disciple of the Buddha who listens to his teachings. See Buswell and Lopez, *Dictionary of Buddhism*, 850.

³³ A *du jue* 獨覺 (*pratyekabuddha*) attains enlightenment through his own efforts without receiving instructions from a buddha. See Buswell and Lopez, *Dictionary of Buddhism*, 673.

said: “[As] the doctor said that there is no other medicine to cure this illness, you may take it without it being an offense.” After the *bhikṣu* heard this, it was convenient for him to eat garlic for his disease in the monastery. He made use of a room, bedding, a felt mat, and the toilet, and he came and went among the assembly. Sometimes he circumambulated the *caitya*,³⁴ or worshiped at an incense platform.³⁵ He visited laymen and taught the Dharma to them. At times, he accepted an invitation and visited a donor’s house, went to a spirit temple³⁶ in a park, or unexpectedly joined a group of people. Everywhere he went, everyone smelled the garlic and began to think badly [of the monk], saying: “Although these *śramaṇas*, sons of the Śākya, have gone forth, they still eat garlic and their pungent breath stinks. How are they any different from us [laypeople]?” When the *bhikṣu* reported this to the Buddha, the Buddha said: “I will now explain how a *bhikṣu* who wants to eat garlic to treat illness should behave. Sick *bhikṣus* who have eaten garlic should stay in a side building of the monastery. They should not use the *saṃgha*’s bedding, nor the toilet rooms. They should not join the assembly, nor explain the teaching to laypeople. They should not circumambulate the *caitya*, nor worship at an incense platform. They should not go to a layman’s house, a park, or a spirit temple, nor join a group of people. They are allowed to eat the garlic in a private place so that if people see them, those people do not become disparaging towards or embarrassed about [the monastic order]. After taking [the garlic], they should remain in that place for seven days. If they have taken onions, they should stay there for three days. In the case of leeks, one day. Thereafter, they should bathe, wash their clothes, and use perfume. When no smell remains, they may enter the monastery. As stated above, if one goes against these regulations, one commits a transgression.”

時有苾芻食噉蒜已。來詣佛所禮佛隻足。在一面立。佛言苾芻。可坐一心聽我說法。時彼苾芻聞佛勅已。重禮世尊一邊而坐。佛爲說法。彼聽法時數便迴面。恐有惡氣輕觸尊儀。如是再三。佛言。苾芻汝當一心聽我所說。苾芻亦復再三向外迴面。便禮佛足奉辭而去。

爾時世尊知而故問。阿難陀何故彼苾芻。聽我法時數數迴面。阿難陀言。由彼噉蒜恐觸尊儀。故數迴面。佛告阿難陀。諸苾芻輩有食蒜耶。阿難陀言有。佛言。由彼食蒜障入聖道。向不食蒜者聽我說法。以金剛智

³⁴ *Zhidi* 制底 (*caitya*) is a general term for a venerated place, such as a *stūpa*. See Muller, *Digital Dictionary*, s.v. *zhiti* 支提, last accessed September 6, 2020; Buswell and Lopez, *Dictionary of Buddhism*, 161.

³⁵ *Xiang tai* 香臺 (“incense platform”) is another general term for a venerated place.

³⁶ *Tian chao* 天廟 (“spirit temple”) probably refers to a shrine for a spirit or a deity.

杵。摧壞二十身見大山。得預流果。是故阿難陀。從今以往制諸苾芻。不應食蒜及葱韭類。食者得越法罪。

于時舍利子在衆中坐。便作是念。今此苾芻不得見諦。明當見不。即便觀察。明亦無緣能見諦理。即更深入第四靜慮。觀其後際。亦不見彼證聖之日。即從定起而說頌曰

由於少時間 散念不專注
令彼未來世 不見真諦理

爾時世尊。知舍利子心所念已。告言。舍利子。汝今不應於佛境界而輒思量。此乃超過一切聲聞獨覺境界。然於未來有佛出世。名一切尊。此人於彼佛法之中。出家修行斷盡諸漏得阿羅漢果。

佛作是念。由彼苾芻食噉蒜故。障見真理。是故苾芻不應噉蒜。食者得越法罪。

時有苾芻身嬰疾病。詣醫人所告言賢首。我有如是病幸爲處方。告言。聖者應可服蒜。患得銷除。報言。賢首。佛不聽食。醫曰。此是病藥非餘能差。苾芻白佛。佛言。醫云此藥非餘差者。服之無犯。苾芻聞已便於寺中。爲病食蒜。受用房舍床榻氈席大小行處。及以衆中出入往來。或繞制底或禮香臺。經過俗人爲其說法。或時受請詣施主家。或至園林天廟之處。衆人聚集輒往其中。所到之處諸人咸聞蒜臭。共生嫌賤。作如是語。沙門釋子雖復出家。而還噉蒜臭氣相熏。與我何別。苾芻白佛。佛言。苾芻有病。欲食蒜者。所有行法我今當說。諸病苾芻若食蒜者。應住寺側邊房。不得用僧臥具及大小行室。不得入衆。亦不爲俗人說法。不遶制底。不禮香臺。不往俗家。園林天廟衆人聚處皆不應往。可於屏處而噉服之。設人見時不生譏恥。若服了時。於七日內仍住於此。服葱可停三日。若韭一日。後方洗浴并可洗衣香熏。無氣後方入寺。如上所制。不依行者得越法罪。

2. Rules for nuns

2.1. Dharmaguptaka vinaya (T 1428, 22: 736c4–737b15)³⁷

At that time, the Bhagavat³⁸ was staying in the Upper Hall³⁹ on the bank of the Monkey Pool in Vaiśālī. At the time, elsewhere, there was a field of garlic, and when the *bhikṣuṇī* Sthūlanandā⁴⁰ went for a walk not far from the field, the owner of the field asked: “Lady, do you need garlic?” She declared: “I need garlic.” So, he gave [her] garlic. After that *bhikṣuṇī* had obtained the garlic, she returned [to that place] frequently. Not far away [from the field] she went for a walk; the man saw her and again asked: “Lady, do you need more garlic?” She declared: “I do. If I get garlic then I can eat.” So, he again gave her garlic. After he had given the garlic, he ordered the field’s guard: “From now on, you should, each day, give five bulbs of garlic to each *bhikṣuṇī*.”⁴¹ The owner then left a man to guard the field [while] he himself went to Vaiśālī to sell his garlic. The *bhikṣuṇī* Sthūlanandā returned to the *saṃghārāma* (monastery) and said to the [other] *bhikṣuṇīs*: “Do you know? In a certain place, a certain *dānapati* (donor) will daily give five bulbs of garlic to each *bhikṣuṇī*. Go and get some.” When

³⁷ This text fragment also forms part of a full translation of the Dharmaguptaka *bhikṣuṇīvibhāṅga*. See Heirman, *Rules for Nuns*, Part II, 588–592.

³⁸ *Poqiepo* 婆伽婆 (Bhagavat, in Chinese also often *Shi zun* 世尊, “World-Honored One”) is one of the Buddha’s standard epithets.

³⁹ *Gao ge tang* 高閣堂, *Kūṭāgārasālā*, a kind of hall with an upper room (see Heirman, *Rules for Nuns*, Part II, 274, note 13).

⁴⁰ Sthūlanandā is the prototypical “bad nun.” On this topic, see, in particular, Ohnuma, “Bad Nun.”

⁴¹ Nuns are given *wu mei suan* 五枚蒜. It is not fully clear, however, what this exactly refers to. The character *mei* 枚 literally means ‘trunk, stem, stalk’. Therefore, it is certainly an option to translate *wu mei suan* 五枚蒜, as ‘five garlic scapes,’ even more so when taking into account what a daily portion of garlic could consist of. On the other hand, it might be more logical that nuns like to eat garlic cloves, commonly used in India (see Schmithausen, *The Problem of the Sentience of Plants*, 43–46). So, what to make out then of *wu mei suan* 五枚蒜? Is it five bulbs of garlic, or even five bundles of garlic? In a parallel precept in the Pāli *vinaya*, the term *bhaṇḍika* is used (Vin IV, p. 258). Isaline Blew Horner (*Book of the Discipline*, 243) explains the difficulties to understand this term in the passage on garlic. According to her, it can refer to stalks, bulbs or bundles. In her translation, she prefers ‘bundles’. In that sense, the amount of garlic taken by the nuns is very substantial, which can fit to a story that underscores greed. Given, however, that bulbs of garlic grow on a stalk, and that the character *mei* 枚 can be used as a classifier, I opted for ‘bulbs,’ which still implies that the *bhikṣuṇī* Sthūlanandā takes much more than what one can normally eat in a day.

Sthūlanandā escorted the *śrāmaṇerīs* and the *śikṣamāṇās*⁴² to the garlic field and asked the guard of the garlic: “Where is the owner of the field?” he declared: “He went to Vaiśālī to sell garlic.” The guard of the garlic then said: “Why do you ask?” She answered: “The field’s owner daily gives five bulbs of garlic to each *bhikṣuṇī*. Give it to us now.” The guard of the garlic said: “Wait a while. Wait for the field’s owner to return. I do not have that authority. I am only supposed to guard [the garlic]; that is all!” The *bhikṣuṇī* said: “The lord appeared magnanimous; the slave is not willing to give.” Sthūlanandā then ordered the *śrāmaṇerīs* to pick the garlic. She calculated how much: this for the superior, for the vice-superior, for the *upādhyāya*, for the *ācārya*; and this for the *samānopādhyāyas*, the *samānācāryas*, and the good friends and acquaintances.⁴³ This was to eat that day, this to eat the next day, and this to eat the day after. It was at once clear that all of the garlic in the field had been taken. When the owner of the garlic returned and saw that there was no garlic anymore, he asked the field’s guard: “Why is there no garlic anymore?” He answered: “Lord, because of your faith, you daily granted five bulbs of garlic to each [*bhikṣuṇī*] of the *bhikṣuṇīsaṃgha*. Not long ago, *śrāmaṇerīs* and *śikṣamāṇās* visited me and said to me: ‘Where is the owner of the garlic?’ I answered: ‘He went to Vaiśālī to sell garlic.’ I asked: ‘Why do you ask?’ They answered: ‘The owner of the garlic, each day, gives to each of us five bulbs of garlic. Give it to us now.’ I answered: ‘Wait a while. Wait until the owner of the field returns. I am only guarding [the garlic]; that is all! I do not have that authority.’ The *bhikṣuṇī* said: ‘The lord gives me garlic, but the slave is unwilling to give it to me.’ When she had ordered the *śrāmaṇerīs* to pick the garlic, she calculated how much, saying: ‘This for the superior one, this for the vice-superior one, this for the *upādhyāya*, this for the *ācārya*; and this for the *samānopādhyāyas* and the *samānācāryas*, and this for the good friends and acquaintances. This is to eat today; this is to eat tomorrow; and this is to eat the day after.’ And she ate more and more, and as a result, all the garlic is gone!” The owner of the field rebuked her [to the guard]: “That *bhikṣuṇī* has no shame.

⁴² *Shamini* 沙彌尼 (*śrāmaṇerī*, female novice) and *shichamona* 式叉摩那 (*śikṣamāṇā*, probationer) are the two stages that precede full ordination as a *bhikṣuṇī*. On these stages, see Heirman, *Rules for Nuns*, Part I, 63–79.

⁴³ Novices and probationers who train to become fully ordained nuns have two teachers—an *upādhyāya* (*heshang* 和上, f. *upādhyāyini*) and an *ācārya* (*asheli* 阿闍梨, f. *ācāryā*). The former focuses on discipline, while the latter focuses on the Dharma. See Heirman, *Rules for Nuns*, Part II, 402, note 102 and 658–659, note 140. *Samānopādhyāyas* are the fellow pupils of a particular *upādhyāya*; *samānācāryas* are the fellow pupils of a particular *ācārya*.

Her appetite is insatiable. To outsiders, she praises herself: ‘I know the right doctrine.’ In this way, how can there be the right doctrine? She just makes a *dānapati* give. Yet, she should know contentment. Moreover, she took everything without even seeing the owner.”

When the *bhikṣuṇīs* heard of this, those among them who were modest and contented, who practiced the *dhūtas* (ascetic practices), who were desirous for training, and who knew shame, rebuked the *bhikṣuṇī* Sthūlanandā: “Why did you take all of someone else’s garlic, and also take it away to eat and not leave anything?”

When the *bhikṣuṇīs* reported it to the *bhikṣus*, and the *bhikṣus* reported it to the World-Honored One, the World-Honored One because of it gathered the *bhikṣusamgha* and rebuked the *bhikṣuṇī* Sthūlanandā: “What you do is wrong. It is not proper behavior, it is not the conduct of a *śramaṇa*, it is not pure conduct, it is not fit conduct. It ought not to be done. Why, without seeing the owner, did you pick all of his garlic?”

When the World-Honored One had rebuked her in innumerable ways, he declared to the *bhikṣus*: “In the past, there was a *brāhmaṇa*. He was one hundred and twenty years old and his body was emaciated. This *brāhmaṇa*’s wife was beautiful beyond compare and she gave birth to many sons and daughters. In his heart, this *brāhmaṇa* was attached to his wife and to his sons and daughters and, initially, he did not leave them. Because of this, his affection [for them] was outstanding and his feelings were sincere. Later, he reached the end of his life and was reborn among the wild geese. All of his feathers were gold in color. Because of his former merit, he remembered his former life, and said to himself: ‘By what means should I raise these sons and daughters and make sure that they are not poor?’ Day after day, he went to his house, and each day he dropped a golden feather, and left. The sons and daughters collected [the feathers] and thought to themselves: ‘Why does the king of the wild geese come each day to drop for us one golden feather, and then leave? We better wait until he arrives, take an opportunity to grab him, and pluck out all of his golden feathers.’ It happened as they had planned—they grabbed him and they plucked out his golden feathers. After they had taken them, [the goose] grew white feathers.”

The Buddha declared to the *bhikṣus*: “If you want to know who at that time died as a *brāhmaṇa* and became a goose. How could it be anyone else? Do not be surprised. It is the owner of the field. His beautiful wife who has given birth to many sons and daughters is the *bhikṣuṇī* Sthūlanandā. The sons and daughters are the *śikṣamāṇās* and *śrāmaṇerīs*. Due to their initial desire, they caused all of the feathers to be gone and they made [the goose] grow white feathers. Now,

again due to desire, they cause all of the garlic to be gone and impoverish [the owner of the field].”

When the World-Honored One had rebuked the *bhikṣuṇī* Sthūlanandā in innumerable ways, he declared to the *bhikṣus*: “This *bhikṣuṇī* is the first wrongdoer of all kinds of impure things.⁴⁴ Hereafter, I lay down the precept for *bhikṣuṇīs* and assemble the ten motives—up to and including the enduring presence of the true law.⁴⁵ One who wishes to set forth the precept must set it forth as follows: ‘If a *bhikṣuṇī* eats garlic, she [commits] a *pācittika*.’”

The meaning of “*bhikṣuṇī*” is as above.⁴⁶

If a *bhikṣuṇī* eats raw garlic, cooked garlic, or garlic mixed [with other food], each bite is a *pācittika*.

A *bhikṣu* [commits] a *duṣkṛta*. A *śikṣamāṇā*, a *śrāmaṇera*,⁴⁷ or a *śrāmaṇerī* [commits] a *duṣkṛta*. This is referred to as a violation.

It is not a violation if she has a certain kind of disease and rolls garlic into a cake and eats it; if it cannot be cured with other medicines and she can take only garlic to get well, she is allowed to take it; if she rubs an ulcer [with garlic], it is not a violation.

It is not a violation when the precept was not yet laid down at the outset, when one is deluded with deranged thoughts, or when one is tormented by suffering.

爾時婆伽婆。在毘舍離彌猴江側高閣堂上。時異處有蒜園。偷羅難陀比丘尼去園不遠而行。園主問言。阿姨欲須蒜耶。報言須蒜。即時蒜與。此比丘尼得蒜已。後數數復往去。彼不遠而行。其人見已復語言。阿姨更須蒜耶。報言須。我若得蒜便能食。即復與蒜。與蒜已勅守園人言。從今日給比丘尼人各五枚蒜。時園主留一人守園。自持蒜詣毘舍離賣。偷羅難陀比丘尼還至僧伽藍中。語諸比丘尼言。汝等知不。某處某甲檀越。日給比丘尼人各五枚蒜。可往迎取。時偷羅難陀。將沙彌尼式叉摩那即往蒜

⁴⁴ For a detailed analysis of this sentence, see Heirman, *Rules for Nuns*, Part II, 303, note 151.

⁴⁵ The Buddha enumerates ten motives for laying down the precepts for monks and nuns. Only the tenth is mentioned here. All ten motives relate to the prosperity of the community, its monastic members, and the Dharma. The ten motives are enumerated in the Dharmaguptaka *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga* in the first rule for nuns at T 1428, 22: 714a8–13. See Heirman, *Rules for Nuns*, Part II, 243.

⁴⁶ “*Bhikṣuṇī*” is defined in the first rule for nuns at T 1428, 22: 714a15–21. See Heirman, *Rules for Nuns*, Part II, 244. Put simply, a *bhikṣuṇī* is a properly ordained full member of the monastic community.

⁴⁷ A *shami* 沙彌 (*śrāmaṇera*) is a male novice.

園。問守蒜人言。園主何處。報言。詣毘舍離賣蒜。時守蒜人言。何故問耶。答言。園主日給比丘尼人各五枚蒜。今可與我。守蒜人言。小住。須園主來。我不得自在。我正可守視而已耳。比丘尼語言。大家見施奴不肯與。偷羅難陀。即勅沙彌尼拔取蒜。數知多少。此與上座次座和上阿闍梨。此與同和上同阿闍梨親厚知識。此今日食。此明日食。此後日食。即時現園蒜取盡。蒜主還見蒜盡。問守園者言。蒜何故盡。答言大家。先信樂故。日給比丘尼僧人各五枚蒜。向有沙彌尼式叉摩那來至我所語我言。蒜主今爲所在。我答言。入毘舍離賣蒜。我問言何故問。答我言。蒜主日與我人各五枚蒜。今可與我。我答言。小住。待園主還。我正守視而已耳。不得自由。比丘尼言。大家與我蒜。而奴不肯與我。時即勅沙彌尼拔取蒜已。數知多少言。此與上座。此與次座。此與和上。此與阿闍梨。此與同和上同阿闍梨。此與親厚知識。此今日食。此明日食。此後日食。并復並噉。以是故園蒜都盡耳。園主即譏嫌言。此比丘尼無有慚愧。受無厭足。外自稱言。我知正法。如是何有正法。正使檀越施與。猶應知足。況不見主而取盡。

時諸比丘尼聞。其中有少欲知足行頭陀樂學戒知慚愧者。呵責偷羅難陀比丘尼。汝等云何。盡拔取他蒜并並噉持去不留遺餘。

時諸比丘尼往白諸比丘。諸比丘往白世尊。世尊以此因緣集比丘僧。呵責偷羅難陀比丘尼言。汝所爲非。非威儀非沙門法非淨行非隨順行。所不應爲。云何不見主拔取他蒜盡。

爾時世尊以無數方便呵責已告諸比丘。往昔有一婆羅門。年百二十形體羸瘦。此婆羅門婦端政無比多生男女。此婆羅門繫心其婦及諸男女。初不捨離。以此愛著情篤。遂至命終便生雁中。其身毛羽盡爲金色。以前福因緣故自識宿命。內白思惟。我當以何等方便養活此男女使不貧苦。日日來至其家日落一金羽而去。男女得之便自思惟。以何因緣此雁王日來落一金羽與我而去。我等寧可伺其來時方便捉之盡取金羽。如其所謀。即捉拔取金羽。取已即更生白羽。

佛告諸比丘。欲知爾時婆羅門死爲雁者。豈異人乎莫作異觀。即園主是。其端政婦多生男女者。即偷羅難陀比丘尼是。男女者。即式叉摩那沙彌尼等是。以本貪愛故令金羽盡。更生白羽。今復愛故令蒜盡。更得貧窮。

世尊以無數方便呵責偷羅難陀比丘尼已告諸比丘。此比丘尼多種有漏處最初犯戒。自今已去與比丘尼結戒。集十句義乃至正法久住。欲說戒者當如是說。若比丘尼噉蒜者波逸提。

比丘尼義如上。

若比丘尼噉生蒜熟蒜若雜蒜者咽咽波逸提。

比丘突吉羅。式叉摩那沙彌沙彌尼突吉羅。是謂爲犯。

不犯者。或有如是病。以餅裹蒜食。若餘藥所不治。唯須服蒜差聽服。若塗瘡不犯。

不犯者最初未制戒癡狂心亂痛惱所纏。

2.2. Mahīśāsaka vinaya (T 1421, 22: 86c7–23)

At that time, when *bhikṣuṇīs* were eating raw and cooked garlic before noon and after noon, some were eating it plain and some were eating it mixed [with other food], and their rooms were foul-smelling. When householders came to see them and smelled the foul odor of the garlic, they criticized them: “It smells just like a kitchen in a layperson’s house.” Later, when *bhikṣuṇīs* were visiting the home of a householder, the householder smelled the foul odor of the garlic and then said: “Ladies, go far away. There is a foul odor of garlic coming from your mouths.” The *bhikṣuṇīs* felt ashamed.

Further, when a garlic vendor invited the *bhikṣuṇīs* in order to offer them garlic, his [offerings] impoverished him, and there was no longer food [for his family]. His family members said: “If you cannot provide food for us, then let us leave. Then you can become an even better servant to the *bhikṣuṇīs*.” When the neighbors heard this, they rebuked him: “Your own family has no food. Why do you entertain the *bhikṣuṇīs*?” He answered with all details. There were some [neighbors] who did not believe in the teaching of the Buddha who said: “Because of your close relations with the *bhikṣuṇīs*, you are now suffering this hardship. In fact, the closer you become to them, the worse you will make it. These [*bhikṣuṇīs*] originally went forth to seek liberation. But now they crave for good food. That is not the way of a *śramaṇa*. They are violating the way of a *śramaṇa*.”

When the senior *bhikṣuṇīs* heard it, they rebuked [the *bhikṣuṇīs*] in many ways. And then [it continues, as in the other, earlier precepts], until [the Buddha said]: “I now lay down the precept for *bhikṣuṇīs*.” It is as explained above.⁴⁸ “From now on, the precept should be taught as follows: ‘If a *bhikṣuṇī* eats garlic, she [commits] a *pācittika*.’”

If a *bhikṣuṇī* eats raw garlic, each bite is a *pācittika*.

If she eats cooked garlic, it is a *duṣkṛta*.

A *śikṣamāṇā* or a *śrāmaṇerī* [commits] a *duṣkṛta*.

If she eats it when ill, or if she is forced to eat it, there is no violation.

⁴⁸ The full procedure is explained in the first part of the Mahīśāsaka *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga* at T 1421, 22: 78a20–25.

爾時諸比丘尼中前中後噉生熟蒜。若空噉若合食噉房舍臭處。諸居士來看聞蒜臭譏訶言。正似白衣家作食處。復有諸比丘尼至長者家。長者聞噉蒜臭。便語言。阿姨遠去口中蒜臭。諸比丘尼羞恥。

復有一賣蒜人。請諸比丘尼與蒜。以此致貧飲食不繼。家人語言。若不能與我食放我令去。汝自長與比丘尼作奴。隣人聞之訶言。汝家自無食。何豫諸比丘尼。具以事答。有不信樂佛法者語言。由汝親近比丘尼故致如此苦。若復親近方當劇是。此等出家本求解脫。而今貪著美味。無沙門行破沙門法。

諸長老比丘尼聞種種訶責。乃至今為諸比丘尼結戒。亦如上說。從今是戒應如是說。若比丘尼噉蒜波逸提。

若噉生蒜咽波逸提。

噉熟蒜突吉羅。

式叉摩那沙彌尼突吉羅。

若病時噉強力伏令噉不犯。

2.3. *Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya* (T 1443, 23: 997a8–c10)

Eating garlic, Precept 73

When the Buddha was in the city of Śrāvastī, there was a householder who grew garlic as a business. In his garden he [also] grew many good vegetables. At the time, there was famine [in the region], and alms were difficult to obtain. The householder each time noticed that the *bhikṣuṇīs* went on their begging round and all returned with an empty alms bowl. The householder said: “Noble ones, in my garden I grow garlic, but I [also] grow many other vegetables. You may take as many as you wish.” The *bhikṣuṇīs* frequently visited his garden and took many beautiful vegetables. The *bhikṣuṇī* Sthūlanandā also went there to take vegetables and in addition took his garlic. The other *bhikṣuṇīs* saw this and said: “Dear sister, are you taking garlic?” Thereupon the *bhikṣuṇī* declared: “Vegetables are no different from garlic; garlic is no different from vegetables.” When the householder saw this, he felt it was intolerable. He then beat her bitterly, seized the vegetables and the garlic, and chased her out of the garden. He condemned her in many ways: “How could you, as *bhikṣuṇī*, eat garlic?”

The *bhikṣuṇīs* told this matter to the *bhikṣus*, and the *bhikṣus* told the Buddha. On this occasion, the Buddha gathered the *bhikṣuṇīsamgha*. The Buddha is one who knows and sees. Knowing [what had happened], he asks; not knowing [what had happened], he does not ask.⁴⁹ If the time is right, he

⁴⁹ I have opted to translate ‘*zhi er wen fei zhi bu wen* 知而問非知不問,’ as ‘knowing [what had happened] he asks; not knowing [what had happened], he does not ask,’

asks; if the time is not right, he does not ask. If there is an advantage, he asks; if there is no advantage, he does not ask. In this way, he removes obstructions and dispels doubt. He asked the *bhikṣuṇī* Sthūlanandā: “Did you really do this improper thing and eat garlic?” She answered: “Indeed, Highly Respected World-Honored One.” Thereupon, he reprimanded her in many ways: “This is not the way of a female *śramaṇa*. This is not pure behavior. This is not a proper thing to do.” He told the *bhikṣuṇīs*: “Considering the ten motives as explained elsewhere,⁵⁰ I lay down in the vinaya the following precept for the adepts (*śrāvaka*), *bhikṣuṇīs*, disciples. One should set it forth as follows: ‘If a *bhikṣuṇī* eats garlic, she commits a *pāyantikā*.’”

“*Bhikṣuṇī*” refers to [the *bhikṣuṇī*] Sthūlanandā and to all other *bhikṣuṇīs*.

“To eat garlic” means that one swallows it.

“*Pāyantikā*” means that one burns, boils, and falls down. If one commits such an offense, one falls into the bad realms of beings in hell, animals, or hungry ghosts, and one suffers the bitterness of being burned and boiled. If one commits such an offense, and if one does not sincerely distance oneself from it, one can obstruct all good dharmas. Because of these meanings, it is called a *pāyantikā*.⁵¹ What are the features of this offense? If a *bhikṣuṇī* eats garlic, she always commits a *pāyantikā*.

Then all of the *bhikṣus* still had some doubts and asked the World-Honored One: “Please, Virtuous One, could you tell us the reason from the past that

parallel to the sentences that follow (the passage also appears at T 1442, 23: 629b10–12, in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *bhikṣuvibhaṅga*; and in the Sanskrit *Śayanāsanavastu* (*vastu* on lodging) of the Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya, Gnoli, *Gilgit Manuscript*, 47). The Sanskrit text (*‘jānakā prcchakā buddhā bhagavantaḥ, jānantaḥ prcchanti, ajānanto na prcchanti,* ‘Enlightened Bhagavats are those who know and ask; knowing, they ask; not knowing, they do not ask’) corroborates the translation. There is, however, a variant reading in the so-called three editions and in the Palace edition: instead of *‘zhi er wen fei zhi bu wen* 知而問非知不問,’ it says *‘zhi er wen fei bu zhi wen* 知而問非不知問,’ ‘knowing [what had happened], he asks; it is not that he asks without knowing [what had happened].’ These three editions, commonly dated between the twelfth and the seventeenth century, as well as the so-called Palace edition (*gong* 宮 edition; an edition dated to the twelfth century belonging to the Japanese imperial library), are all related to a *tripitaka* edition compiled and printed between 1080 and 1176 in Fuzhou, in the south of China (cf. Mizuno, *Buddhist Sutras*, 176–177).

⁵⁰ The ten motives are explained in the first rule for monks in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *bhikṣuvibhaṅga* at T 1442, 23: 629b21–26.

⁵¹ On the various interpretations of the etymology of this term, see von Hinüber, “Die Bestimmung der Schulzugehörigkeit buddhistischer Texte,” 63–66.

caused the *bhikṣuṇī* Sthūlanandā to be beaten by [the owner] and chased away from the garden due to her greed?” The Buddha said to the *bhikṣus*: “The *bhikṣuṇī* Sthūlanandā has not only in the present encountered disadvantageous situations because of her greed. She also met with disaster in the past, even leading to her death. Listen carefully [and] I will explain.

“In the past, there was a thief who made a hole in a wall and entered the house of a king. [The thief] stole a hoard of gold and silver and [other] precious objects, bundled them together, and left. Subsequently, because of the hole [in the wall], she lost a spoon. When she returned to collect it, she was captured by the guards, and brought to the king. When [the king] ordered the court officials to cut off her hands and feed, a heavenly being spoke a verse:

One should not be too greedy, greed is an evil thing.
If one is too greedy, one loses everything one has obtained.
Just as she went back for the lost spoon, she met with plenty of distress.

“*Bhikṣus*, if you want to know who the thief of the past was, how could it be anyone else? It was the current *bhikṣuṇī* Sthūlanandā. Because of her greed, she reaped only useless bitterness. Today, it is just the same.

“*Bhikṣus*, there was one more occasion when this *bhikṣuṇī* suffered a great loss of profit and lost what she had gained because of her greed. Listen carefully [and] I will explain.

“In the past, in the city of Vārāṇasī, there was a goldsmith. Not long after he married, a girl was born. She was very beautiful and her appearance was superb; she was most delightful. Once the girl had grown up, her father passed away. He was reborn as a goose, and he became the king of the geese. The girl suffered from poverty and extreme hardship. As king of the geese, the father remembered his former livelihood, and he watched his daughter with concern. How could he help her? Subsequently, when he saw her poverty and [knew that] she was suffering hardship, he flew to Ratnadvīpa (Island of Jewels) because of his attachment to her.⁵² He held a precious pearl in his mouth, and in the morning left it on his daughter’s doorstep. The daughter obtained the pearl and kept it deeply hidden. The king of the geese then brought [more pearls] regularly. The daughter stored them all and did not spend them at all. In this way, the daughter had many precious pearls. She thought: ‘Who is giving me pearls?’

⁵² The Chinese term *bao zhou* 寶洲 can refer to a wonderful land of a buddha, or to the name of the island Ratnadvīpa (Island of Jewels, cf. Akanuma, *Indo Bukkyō koyū meishi jiten*, 543, s.v. Ratnadvīpa), sometimes also seen as the island of Sri Lanka.

Then, late at night, she waited near the doorway. She saw the goose coming and thought: ‘There must be a treasury of pearls in the body of that goose. Each time it comes to the doorway, it leaves one [pearl], and then goes away. How can I catch him and take all the pearls?’ In order to catch the goose, she secretly prepared a net. The king of the geese noticed the net and thought: ‘This evil thing is not a sign of kindness. It is meant to hurt me.’ Thereupon he flew away and did not return again. A heavenly being spoke a verse:

One should not be too greedy, greed is an evil thing.

If one is too greedy, one loses everything one has obtained.

Because you wanted to catch the goose, the pearls stopped coming.

“*Bhikṣus*, if you want to know who that daughter of the past was, how could it be anyone else? It was the current *bhikṣuṇī* Sthūlanandā. Because of her greed, she lost the precious goods. Due to her greed, she was recently beaten by [the owner] and chased away from the garden, and lost all hope. For this reason, *bhikṣuṇīs* should not be too greedy.”

噉蒜學處第七十三

佛在室羅伐城。時有長者種蒜爲業。於其園中多生好菜。時世飢儉乞求難得。長者每見諸苾芻尼爲行乞食皆空鉢而歸。長者告言。聖者。我園種蒜多生餘菜。可隨意取。諸苾芻尼。頻往彼園多將美菜。時吐羅難陀尼。亦往取菜并取其蒜。餘尼見告。仁取蒜耶。尼便報曰。菜即是蒜蒜即是菜。長者見已情生不忍。即便苦打奪菜及蒜驅出園外。種種譏嫌。云何苾芻尼而噉蒜耶。

諸尼以緣白苾芻。苾芻白佛。佛由此事集苾芻尼衆。佛是知者見者。知而問非知不問。時而問非時不問。有利而問無利不問。破決隄防爲除疑惑。問吐羅難陀尼曰。汝實作斯不端嚴事而噉蒜耶。白言實爾。大德世尊。即便種種訶責。汝非沙門女法。非淨行法。非端嚴事。告諸苾芻尼。我觀十利廣說如餘。爲諸聲聞苾芻尼弟子。於毘奈耶制其學處。應如是說。若復苾芻尼。噉蒜者波逸底迦

尼謂吐羅難陀。或復餘尼。

噉蒜者。謂咽食。

波逸底迦者。謂是燒煮墮落義。謂犯罪者墮在地獄傍生餓鬼惡道之中。受燒煮苦。又犯此罪。若不慙懃說除。便能障礙所有善法。有此諸義故名波逸底迦。此中犯相其事云何。若苾芻尼噉蒜者。皆得墮罪

時諸苾芻咸皆有疑。請世尊曰。唯願大德。爲說吐羅難陀尼爲貪心故被他所打驅出園外往昔因緣。佛告諸苾芻。吐羅尼非但今時爲貪心故遭諸無利事。往昔之時亦遭殃苦至於死處。汝等諦聽。我當爲說。

昔有一賊穿牆作孔而入王家。盜多金銀諸妙珍寶裹持而出。遂於孔邊遺忘一杓。却來欲取為防守人之所擒獲。送至王所。勅令法官截去手足。時有天人為說頌曰

不應作多貪 貪是罪惡事
若作多貪者 所獲皆散失
如彼求遺杓 遂遭眾苦難

汝等苾芻。於意云何。昔時賊者豈異人乎。今吐羅尼是。由其貪心獲無利苦。今亦如是。

復次諸苾芻。此尼由懷貪故。多遭無利所獲散失。汝等諦聽。我今更說。

乃往古昔。於婆羅痾斯城中有一金寶作師。娶妻未久遂誕一女。容儀端正顏色超絕甚可愛樂。女年長大其父命過。遂生鵝趣得為鵝王。女受貧苦甚大艱辛。父為鵝王憶前生事作心觀女。若為存濟。遂見貧窮受諸苦惱。戀愛女故飛往寶洲。銜一寶珠於晨朝時置女門下。女收寶珠遂深藏舉。鵝王如是每且常送。女亦收藏竟不費用。如其女有多寶珠。念曰誰與我珠。即於後夜側門伺候。遂見鷲來便作是念。此鷲身中並是寶藏。每來門首棄一而去。作何方便我當捉得總取寶珠。為求鷲故密張羅網。鷲王見網作如是念。此罪惡物不識恩情而欲害我。便即飛去更不重來。天說頌曰

不應作多貪 貪是罪惡事
若作多貪者 所獲皆散失
汝今為捉鷲 寶珠便斷絕

汝等苾芻於意云何。昔時女者豈異人乎。今吐羅難陀苾芻尼是。由貪心故失諸寶物。今由貪心被他所打驅出園外絕其希望。由是義故。諸苾芻尼不應多貪。

References

- T Taishō shinshū daizōkyō 大正新修大藏經. 85 vols., ed. Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡邊海旭. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924–1934.
- Akanuma Chizen 赤沼智善. *Indo Bukkyō koyū meishi jiten* 印度佛教固有名詞辭典 [Dictionary of Indian Buddhist proper nouns]. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1994 (originally, Kyōto: Hōzōkan, 1967).
- Buswell, Robert E. and Donald S. Lopez, eds. *The Princeton Dictionary of Buddhism*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2014.
- Chung, Jin-il. *Die Pravāraṇā in den kanonischen Vinaya-Texten der Mūlasarvāstivādin und der Sarvāstivādin*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.
- Clarke, Shayne. “Monks Who Have Sex: Pārājika Penance in Indian Buddhist Monasticism.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 37.1 (2009): 1–43.
- . “Vinayas.” In *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, Vol. 1: *Literatures and Languages*, ed. Jonathan A. Silk, 60–87. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2015.
- Dhammadinnā, Bhikkhunī. “The Funeral of Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī and Her Followers in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya.” *The Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies* 17 (2016): 25–74.
- Funayama Tōru. “The Acceptance of Buddhist Precepts by the Chinese in the Fifth Century.” *Journal of Asian History* 38.2 (2004): 97–119.
- Gnoli, Raniero. *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Śayanāsanavastu and the Adhikaraṇavastu, Being the 15th and the 16th Sections of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin*. Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1978.
- Heirman, Ann. *‘The Discipline in Four Parts’. Rules for Nuns According to the Dharmaguptakavinaya*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2002.
- . “Vinaya from India to China.” In *The Spread of Buddhism*, ed. Ann Heirman and Stephan-Peter Bumbacher, 167–202. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- and Tom De Rauw. “Offenders, Sinners and Criminals: The Consumption of Forbidden Food.” *Acta Orientalia* 59.1 (2006): 57–83.
- and Mathieu Torck. *A Pure Mind in a Clean Body. Bodily Care in the Buddhist Monasteries of Ancient India and China*. Gent: Academia Press, 2012.
- . “Washing and Dyeing Buddhist Monastic Robes,” *Acta Orientalia* 67.4 (2014): 467–488.
- Hinüber, Oskar von. “Die Bestimmung der Schulzugehörigkeit buddhistischer Texte nach sprachlichen Kriterien.” In *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken*

- der Hīnayāna-Literatur, Erster Teil, 57–75.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985.
- Hinüber, Oskar von. *Das Pātimokkhasutta der Theravādin, Studien zur Literatur des Theravāda-Buddhismus II.* Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1999.
- Horner, Isaline Blew. *The Book of the Discipline, Vol. III.* London: Luzac & Company Ltd., 1957 (first edition Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1942).
- Hu-von Hinüber, Haiyan. *Das Poṣadhavastu. Vorschriften für die buddhistische Beichtfeier im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins.* Reinbek: Dr. Inge Wezler Verlag für Orientalistische Fachpublikationen, 1994.
- Hüsken, Ute. “Gender and Early Buddhist Monasticism.” In *Saddharmāmṛtam. Festschrift für Jens-Uwe Hartmann zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Oliver von Criegern, Gudrun Melzer, and Johannes Schneider, 215–230. Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, 2018.
- Kieffer-Pülz, Petra. “Die buddhistische Gemeinde.” In *Der Buddhismus I: Der indische Buddhismus und seine Verzweigungen*, ed. Heinz Bechert et al., 281–402. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2000.
- Kieschnick, John. “Buddhist Vegetarianism in China.” In *Of Tripod and Palate: Food, Politics, and Religion in Traditional China*, ed. Roel Sterckx, 186–212. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Kleine, Christoph. “Health Care in Indian Monasteries, Selections from Yijing’s *Record of the Inner Law Sent Home from the Southern Seas*.” In *Buddhism and Medicine, An Anthropology of Premodern Sources*, ed. Pierce Salguero, 145–159. New York: Columbia University Press, 2017.
- Langenberg, Amy Paris. “Mahāsāṅghika-Lokottaravāda Bhikṣuṇī Vinaya, The Intersection of Womanly Virtue and Buddhist Asceticism.” In *Women in Early Indian Buddhism, Comparative Textual Studies*, ed. Alice Collett, 80–96. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- . “Female Monastic Healing and Midwifery: A View from the Vinaya Tradition.” *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 21 (2014): 152–187.
- . “Nuns, Laywomen, and Healing. Three Rules from a Sanskrit Nuns’ Disciplinary Code.” *Buddhism and Medicine, An Anthropology of Premodern Sources*, ed. Pierce Salguero, 113–117. New York: Columbia University Press, 2017.
- . *Birth in Buddhism. The Suffering Fetus and Female Freedom.* London: Routledge, 2017.
- Leslie, Julia. *The Perfect Wife.* Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Mizuno, Kōgen. *Buddhist Sutras. Origin, Development, Transmission.* Tokyo: Kosei Publishing, 1982.
- Muller, Charles, ed. *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism.* <http://www.buddhism-dict.net/ddb/>.

- Ohnuma, Reiko. “Bad Nun: Thullanandā in Pāli Canonical and Commentarial Sources.” *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 20 (2013): 18–66.
<https://blogs.dickinson.edu/buddhistethics/?s=ohnuma>.
- Salguero, Pierce. *Translating Buddhist Medicine in Medieval China*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014.
- . “Rules on Medicines from the *Five-Part Vinaya* of the Mahīśāsaka School.” In *Buddhism and Medicine, An Anthropology of Premodern Sources*, ed. Pierce Salguero, 125–129. New York: Columbia University Press, 2017.
- Schmithausen, Lambert. *The Problem of the Sentience of Plants in Earliest Buddhism*. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1991.
- . *Fleischverzehr und Vegetarismus im indischen Buddhismus bis ca. zur Mitte des ersten Jahrtausends n. Chr.* Bochum: projectverlag, 2020, 3 Vols. (Hamburg Buddhist Studies 12).
- Wujastyk, Dominik. *The Roots of Ayurveda. Selections from Sanskrit Medical Writings*. London: Penguin Books, 2003.
- Yuyama, Akira. *Systematische Übersicht über die buddhistische Sanskrit-Literatur*, Erster Teil: *Vinaya-Texte*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1979.
- Zou, Ang. *The Life of Daoxuan: According to Others and His Own Words*. Singapore: Buddhist College of Singapore and Kong Meng San Phor Kark See Monastery, 2019.