

# Ānanda's Faults\*

Venerable Yinshun 印順

Source text: Huayu Collection, Volume 3 《華雨集》第三冊〈阿難過在何處〉

Translated by the Yinshun Cultural & Educational Foundation Translation Team

印順文教基金會翻譯組

## Table of Contents

1. BACKGROUND	246
2. THE FAULT RELATING TO MINOR PRECEPTS	250
3. THE FAULT RELATING TO WOMEN'S ORDINATION	258
4. THE OTHER FAULTS RELATING TO WOMEN	266
The Fault of Allowing Women to Pay Respect First and Sullyng the Buddha's Feet with Tears	266
The Fault of Allowing Women to See the Buddha's Private Parts	267
5. THE FAULTS RELATING TO ĀNANDA'S FAILURE AS THE BUDDHA'S ATTENDANT	269
The Fault of Not Requesting the Buddha to Remain in the World	269
The Fault of Not Providing the Buddha with Water When He Asked	272
The Fault of Treading on the Buddha's Robe	274
6. OTHER FAULTS	275
The Fault of Refusing to Be The Buddha's Attendant	275
The Fault of Excusing a Mistake Improperly	275
The Fault of Still Having Some Defilements	276
7. CONCLUSION	277

## 1. Background

Ānanda served as the Buddha's personal assistant for 25 years and was lauded as the most learned<sup>1</sup> among all the Buddha's disciples. Over many long years, he tirelessly and respectfully served the Tathāgata<sup>2</sup> without complaint and instructed the fourfold community.<sup>3</sup> Ānanda was smart, amiable, and adept at handling all kinds of tricky situations in accordance with the Dharma. Among the Buddha's great disciples, he is certainly a sage worthy of reverence.

Records found mainly in the vinaya canon generally agree, with minor variations, that Ānanda served the Tathāgata until his time at Kuśinagara where the Buddha entered *parinirvāṇa*. At that time, the elder Mahākāśyapa led a group of 500 disciples who were rushing from afar to Kuśinagara to attend the Buddha's cremation. Then, Mahākāśyapa convened the First Council in the city of Rājagṛha. An assembly of 500 senior bhikṣus [who were selected by Mahākāśyapa] recited and formulated the canon of Dharma teachings. At the convening of the First Council, Mahākāśyapa practically rejected Ānanda. The saṃgha, led by Mahākāśyapa, accused Ānanda of a series of faults. Although Ānanda did not admit that he had committed any faults, out of respect for the saṃgha and consideration for the community's unity, he intentionally repented to that saṃgha community.

When the Buddha was still alive, Ānanda had been exemplary in following the monastic code, (only once being admonished by the Buddha in connection to Venerable Udāyin). Thus, accusing Ānanda of a series of faults shortly after the Buddha's *parinirvāṇa* is anomalous and controversial. In my "Preface to the *Guabo Collected Works*" (1941),<sup>4</sup> I indicated that there was some

---

\* This article was originally published in the journal *Haichaoyin* 海潮音 46, no. 1 (1965): 10–15. Note that all headings and subheadings in this article have been added by the translators, based on direction given by Venerable Yinshun at the start of each section. The original Chinese text lists each section by number.

<sup>1</sup> Here, "learned" is a reference to the discipline of having heard and remembered the most Dharma teachings from the Buddha.

<sup>2</sup> Tathāgata is another word used to refer to a buddha.

<sup>3</sup> The fourfold community refers to the male and female monastic and lay followers.

<sup>4</sup> This "preface" was not written as a preface. Rather, Venerable Yinshun provided some feedback on the manuscript and the author adopted this feedback as the preface to the published work. Yinshun, "*Guabo wenji xu*" [Preface to the *Guabo Collected Works*].

friction between Ānanda and Mahākāśyapa. Initially I assumed this was due to their dissimilar personalities, but now as I review the matter, it is obvious there were many underlying issues. Ānanda was reprimanded, but what exactly were his faults? After investigating the series of faults [leveled at Ānanda,] I fully understood the situation and discovered the real issue that was occurring within the saṅgha. This is an important event in [understanding] the history of Buddhism. Do allow me to present evidence in detail and explain the matter.

The event of Ānanda being reprimanded is found in the records relating to the First Council, and the versions transmitted by the various Buddhist schools are largely in agreement, as follows.

1. The minor division in the vinaya of the Southern tradition, *Tongye lü · Xiaopin* 銅鑠律 · 小品 [P. *Tambapaṇṇiya Vinaya, Culla-vagga*]<sup>5</sup> records that Ānanda committed five *dukkaṭa* (literally meaning “bad action,” translated herein as a minor offence).
2. The vinaya of the Mahīśāsaka school, *Mishasai bu hexi wufen lü* 彌沙塞部和醯五分律 [*Mahīśāsaka Vinaya of Five Sections*]<sup>6</sup> records that Ānanda committed six minor offences.
3. The earlier vinaya of the Sarvāstivāda school of Mathurā, *Shisong lü* 十誦律 [*Ten-recitation Vinaya*]<sup>7</sup> records that Ānanda committed six minor offences.
4. The Mahāyāna Madhyamaka school’s text, *Da zhidu lun* 大智度論 [*Exegesis on the Great Perfection of Wisdom*]<sup>8</sup> records that Ānanda committed six minor offences. The exegesis details only five faults, and these are consistent with those in the *Shisong lü* but presented in a different order.

<sup>5</sup> RZ IV 430–433. Note that all Pāli sources mentioned by Venerable Yinshun in this article are based on a Japanese Translation of the Pāli Tipiṭaka. For readers’ convenience, the reference to the parallel *Hanyi nanchuan dazangjing* 漢譯南傳大藏經 [Chinese Translation of the Pāli Tipiṭaka] (N), which has been integrated into CBETA, and Pāli sources are also given in this article. Please see Abbreviation section for details of the information. See also “Wubai [jieji] jiandu” 五百 [結集] 犍度 [Chapter on the First Council of 500] in *Jiandu* 犍度 [*Tambapaṇṇiya Vinaya, Second Section*], N 2.4.385a4–387a9; Vin II 287–289.

<sup>6</sup> T 1421.22.191b3–c19.

<sup>7</sup> T 1435.23.449c17–18.

<sup>8</sup> T 1509.25.68a3–b17.

5. The vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika school, *Mohe sengqi lü* 摩訶僧祇律 [Skt. *Mahāsāṃghikavinaya*, *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya*]<sup>9</sup> records that Ānanda committed seven minor offences.
6. The vinaya of the Dharmaguptaka school, *Sifen lü* 四分律 [*Dharmaguptaka Vinaya of Four Sections*]<sup>10</sup> records that Ānanda committed seven minor offences.
7. The *Pinimu jing* 毘尼母經 [*Sūtra on the Vinaya-māṭṛkā*]<sup>11</sup> records that Ānanda committed seven faults, only two of which are detailed, namely neglecting to ask the Buddha about minor precepts [that could be discarded,] and imploring the Buddha to allow women to be ordained.
8. The *Fo bannihuan jing* 佛般泥洹經 [*Sūtra on the Buddha's Parinirvāṇa*],<sup>12</sup> translated by Bo Fazu 帛法祖 (d.u.), records that Ānanda committed seven faults but the discussion mentions only his neglect to request the Buddha to remain in the world.

The information found in the reference sources relating to points 7 and 8 are generally consistent with that in points 5 and 6.

9. The new, edited vinaya of the Kashmiri Sarvāstivāda school, *Genben shuoyiqiyoubu pinaiye za shi* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶雜事 [Skt. *Mūlasarvāstivādivinayaḥśudrakavastu*; *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya on Miscellaneous Matters*],<sup>13</sup> reports that Ānanda committed eight minor offences.
10. The *Jiashe jie jing* 迦葉結經 [*Sūtra on Kāśyapa Convening the Buddhist Council*]<sup>14</sup> reports that Ānanda committed nine faults, and these are consistent with the faults in the *Genben shuoyiqiyoubu pinaiye za shi*.

<sup>9</sup> T 1425.22.492a20–b10.

<sup>10</sup> T 1428.22.967b10–968a2.

<sup>11</sup> T 1463.24.818b2–c9.

<sup>12</sup> T 5.1.175b19–23.

<sup>13</sup> T 1451.24.404c21–405c8.

<sup>14</sup> T 2027.49.5c12–6a29. Note that the ninth fault is that Ānanda still had not eliminated all his defilements and attained arhatship. The remaining eight faults are the same as in the *Genben shuoyiqiyoubu pinaiye za shi* [*Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya on Miscellaneous Matters*].

Apart from the above texts, in the *Zhuanji sanzang ji zazang zhuan* 撰集三藏及雜藏傳 [Record on the Collection of the Tripiṭaka and the Kṣudrakapiṭaka],<sup>15</sup> translated by An Shigao 安世高 (148–180), there is an explanation concerning only the four most serious faults. The various numbers of offences committed by Ānanda in these sources can be categorized into three types: 1) those relating to the vinaya, 2) those relating to women, and 3) those relating to a failure of duty as the Buddha’s attendant. [Among these faults,] the significant ones are neglecting to ask the Buddha about the definition of minor precepts and imploring the Buddha to allow women to be ordained. Therefore, the *Pinimu jing* only discusses these two. Additionally, the *Tongye lü*, *Mishasai bu hexi wufen lü*, and *Shisong lü* all take Ānanda’s neglect to ask the Buddha about the minor precepts as the first fault in the list. The other sources, such as the *Sifen lü*, present imploring the Buddha to allow women to be ordained as the first fault in the list. It is likely that when Ānanda relayed the Buddha’s final words—namely, that minor precepts can be discarded—this event accordingly stirred up many past grievances among the practitioners of Mahākāśyapa’s group. Such was the cause leading to the series of accusations leveled at Ānanda, and even some bygone issues from 20 years ago were brought to the fore.

The various faults are listed below. The only ones that occur in all the sources mentioned above are the first, second, fifth, and sixth.

1. Neglecting to ask the Buddha which are the minor precepts that could be discarded.
2. Imploring the Buddha to allow women to be ordained.
3. Allowing women to first pay respect to the Buddha’s relics, resulting in the relics being defiled [with their tears]. The *Sifen lü* and *Mohe sengqi lü* describe this fault as failing to prevent women from paying their respects to the Buddha, who then sullied the Buddha’s feet with their tears. The *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye za shi* and the *Jiashe jie jing* say Ānanda showed the Buddha’s golden body to women, resulting in them weeping and defiling the Buddha’s feet with their tears.
4. Allowing women to see the Buddha’s private parts (one of the 32 physical marks of a buddha.)
5. Neglecting to ask the Buddha to remain in the world.

---

<sup>15</sup> T 2026.49.2a14–22.

6. Not providing the Buddha with water when being requested to do so. The *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye za shi* records this fault as providing the Buddha with turbid water.
7. Treading on the Buddha's robe while mending it. The *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye za shi* states that this occurred while washing the robe and the *Shisong lü* says it occurred while folding the robe.
8. When the Buddha wanted to present a simile to Ānanda, Ānanda had a different interpretation. Note that in the *Jiashe jie jing*, this record relates to Ānanda [rudely] responding to the Buddha that he took the blame for others' faults.<sup>16</sup>
9. Initially declining to be the Buddha's personal attendant when instructed to that task.

## 2. The Fault Relating to Minor Precepts

The real cause of Ānanda being reprimanded was that at the assembly of the First Council, Ānanda relayed the Buddha's last instructions that minor precepts can be discarded. It is said that because Ānanda failed to ask the Buddha what specifically constitutes minor precepts, the members of the First Council consequently had many and varying opinions. In the end, Mahākāśyapa came forth and put an end to the debate by declaring: "If the Buddha did not regulate it, then no new precepts should be set. What has already been regulated by precepts must not be violated. [One should] follow what the Buddha had taught and sincerely learn it."<sup>17</sup> Given that they [the members of the saṃgha in the First Council] could not reach a consensus on the definition of minor precepts, it would be better to uphold all of the precepts that the Buddha had set. This means what the Buddha had already set as a precept must not be removed and

<sup>16</sup> *Jiashe jie jing* [*Sūtra on Kāśyapa Convening the Buddhist Council*], T 2027.49.6a18–19: "You [Ānanda] have another fault. When the World Honored One reprimanded you, at that time you responded with harsh words that you took the blame for others' faults. This is your third fault." 汝復有過。世尊訶汝，汝時恨言：他犯他坐。是為三過。」

<sup>17</sup> For example, see *Mishasai bu hexi wufen lü* [*Mahīśāsaka Vinaya of Five Sections*], T 1421.22.191c16–18: 「我等已集法竟，若佛所不制，不應妄制；若已制，不得有違。如佛所教，應謹學之。」 and *Sifen lü* [*Dharmaguptaka Vinaya of Four Sections*], T 1428.22.967b24–26: 「若佛先所不制，今不應制。佛先所制，今不應却，應隨佛所制而學。」

what had not been regulated must not be added. What an “absolute dedication” to the Buddha’s regulations!

However, there is no denying that the Buddha’s last instructions did say that “minor precepts can be discarded.” Therefore, Mahākāśyapa’s strict decision [to uphold all of the existing precepts] unavoidably contradicts the Buddha’s intention. Due to this situation, Mahākāśyapa reprimanded Ānanda for not seeking clarification from the Buddha, and charged Ānanda with a minor offence. This incident was like lighting a fuse that led Mahākāśyapa to lay a series of other charges against Ānanda. Therefore, Ānanda’s reprimand at the First Council was not simply because he failed to seek clarification from the Buddha, but indicates that there were internal underlying issues within the saṃgha.

What is the definition of minor precepts? Minor precepts have been translated as lesser precepts, trivial precepts, trifling subprecepts, and prohibitions in accordance with trivial precepts. No definitive decision [on the meaning] was made at the First Council, but we can find clear indications as to what minor precepts are in the respective vinaya texts of each school. These state:

1. Minor precepts refer to all precepts. This explanation can be found in *Shisong lü*, *Binaiye* 鼻奈耶 [*Vinaya*] and the *Sapoduo pini piposha* 薩婆多毘尼毘婆沙 [Skt. *Sarvāstivādavīnaya vibhāṣā*, *Sarvāstivāda Vinaya Vibhāṣā*].<sup>18</sup>
2. Minor precepts refer to all precepts except for the four primary precepts (Skt. *pārājika*). This can be found in *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶 [Skt. *Mūlasarvāstivādavīnaya*, *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*], *Genben sapoduobu lü she* 根本薩婆多部律攝 [Skt. *\*Mūlasarvāstivādavīnayasamgraha*, *Sarvāstivāda Vinaya-samgraha*], and *Lü ershier mingliao lun* 律二十二明了論 [Skt. *\*Vinayadvīṃśati-prasannārthasāstra*; *Treatises on Clarifications of Vinaya with*

---

<sup>18</sup> *Shisong lü* [*Ten-recitation Vinaya*], T 1435.23.449c25–450a26. *Binaiye* [*Vinaya*], T 1464.24.879b20–26. Note that the content related to minor precepts found in *Binaiye* fascicle 7 is parallel to one of the ninety *pāyattika* precepts. In that precept, a certain bhikṣu complains about the precepts by asking: “Why are these trivial precepts needed? Every half month when the precepts are recited, they cause bhikṣus to have doubts, regrets, vexations, worries, and become unsettled.” The trivial precepts in that context can mean all precepts. This precept can be found in all vinayas belonging to different schools. *Sapoduo pini piposha* [*Sarvāstivāda Vinaya Vibhāṣā*], T 1440.23.543a16.

*Twenty-Two Verses*].<sup>19</sup>

3. Minor precepts refer to all precepts excluding the four primary precepts (Skt. *pārājika*) and the thirteen secondary precepts (Skt. *saṃghāvaśeṣa*). This explanation can be found in the *Mohe sengqi lü* and the *Sifen lü*.<sup>20</sup>
4. Minor precepts refer to all precepts excluding the four primary precepts (*pārājika*), the thirteen secondary precepts (*saṃghāvaśeṣa*), and the two indefinite precepts. This definition is found in the *Mishasai bu hexi wufen lü*.<sup>21</sup>

Adopting the first explanation (from the *Shisong lü*, etc.), would the Buddha's instruction that minor precepts can be discarded not amount to permission to discard all the precepts? This interpretation is certainly not possible. So why, then, would such an explanation exist? This explanation is used as an exaggerated reason to object to the notion that minor precepts can be discarded. In the view of the vinaya masters who put forth this explanation, the idea that minor precepts can be discarded equates to total abolition of the vinaya system. That is to say, they view those who agree with discarding the minor (trivial) precepts as monastics who do not value the vinaya or uphold the precepts. There is ample basis for such an interpretation. When comparing the discussions concerning the First Council in the full versions of the vinaya texts belonging to different Buddhist schools, there are two different ways in which Ānanda's conveyance of Buddha's instruction is worded. Examples of the first way are as follows:

---

<sup>19</sup> *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye* [*Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*], T 1442.23.775a21–b18. *Genben sapoduobu lü she* [*Sarvāstivāda Vinaya-saṃgraha*], T 1458.24.576b21–c3. Note that according to this source, the definition appears to correspond to the third point in the list rather than the second. However, in the story attached to this passage, the bhikṣu began to complain about having to recite minor precepts after the first set of primary precepts (*pārājika*) were recited, which implies that he regards minor precepts to begin from the second set of precepts (*saṃghāvaśeṣa*). *Lü ershier mingliao lun* [*Treatises on Clarifications of Vinaya with Twenty-Two Verses*], T 1461.24.667b28–c3.

<sup>20</sup> *Mohe sengqi lü* [*Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya*], T 1425.22.338c21–22; *Sifen lü* [*Dharmaguptaka Vinaya of Four Sections*], T 1428.22.685c07–686a11.

<sup>21</sup> *Mishasai bu hexi wufen lü* [*Mahīśāsaka Vinaya of Five Sections*], T 1421.22.41b4–20.



- *Mohe sengqi lü*, “I [Buddha] shall allow all bhikṣus to discard the minor precepts.”<sup>22</sup>
- *Sifen lü*, “From now on all bhikṣus are allowed to discard the minor precepts.”<sup>23</sup>
- *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye za shi*, “All trifling subprecepts, I hereby allow for them to be discarded, for the sake of helping the saṃgha abide in peace.”<sup>24</sup>

It appears that this matter of discarding minor precepts was to help the monastic community abide in peace, and so there were no limitations as to its application. But, in fact, this placed attention on the fault of discarding minor precepts and was used to portray the ugly side of those who promoted this notion. The reason is that discarding minor precepts is regarded as a forbidden matter in the extant vinaya texts. [The background to this position arose] while Mahākāśyapa was on his way to Kuśinagara. He heard Venerable Upānanda say, “That elder (i.e. Buddha) always says one should do this and not do that (i.e. follow the precepts). Now, we all are free from the suffering of such restrictions and can do as we please with no more obstructions.”<sup>25</sup> This comment about no longer having to uphold the precepts and having no more obstructions is exactly the meaning of discarding minor precepts to abide in peace, is it not? However, such an idea [that minor precepts can be discarded] is what Mahākāśyapa rejected and is the reason he initiated the First Council [to compile the Buddha’s teachings.]

Another example is found in the *pāyattika* group of precepts,<sup>26</sup> in which one rule concerns complaining about the precepts by asking, “Why are these trivial precepts needed? Every half month when the precepts are recited, they

<sup>22</sup> *Mohe sengqi lü* [*Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya*], T 1425.22.492b5–6: 「我當為諸比丘捨細微戒。」

<sup>23</sup> *Sifen lü* [*Dharmaguptaka Vinaya of Four Sections*], T 1428.22.967b12–13: 「為諸比丘捨雜碎戒。」

<sup>24</sup> *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye za shi* [*Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya on Miscellaneous Matters*], T 1451.24.405b4–5: 「所有小隨小戒，我於此中欲有放捨，令苾芻僧伽得安樂住故。」

<sup>25</sup> *Mishasai bu hexi wufen lü* [*Mahīśāsaka Vinaya of Five Sections*], T 1421.22.190b24–26: 「彼長老常言：『應行是，不應行是；應學是，不應學是。』我等於今，始脫此苦！任意所為，無復拘礙。」

<sup>26</sup> The Buddhist monastic code is categorized into several groups of precepts based on their gravity and disciplinary results. In order of severity, they are *pārājika*, *saṃghāvaśeṣa*, *naiḥsargika prāyaścittika*, *pāyattika*, and *pratideśanīya*. The monastic code also includes other subsets of regulations, but these five groups are the main sets of rules that monastics uphold.

cause bhikṣus to have doubts, regrets, vexations, worries, and become unsettled.”<sup>27</sup> What this quote implies is that these trivial precepts cause saṃgha members to have worries and vexations, and so they are not necessary. Is this not consistent with the notion that discarding minor precepts brings peace to the saṃgha? Mahākāśyapa decided to convene an assembly to compile the vinaya [to avoid the problem of monastics discarding the precepts after Buddha’s *parinirvāṇa*]. Yet, Ānanda publicly conveyed the Tathāgata’s final instruction that “minor precepts can be discarded.” This message effectively placed Mahākāśyapa in a problematic position. Clearly, Mahākāśyapa and the monastics who emphasized the vinaya were opposed to the idea of discarding minor precepts. Within this context, it is no surprise then that Ānanda was subsequently charged with a series of offences [at the First Council].

The other way in which Ānanda’s conveyance of the Buddha’s final instruction is represented is by such statements as:

- *Shisong lü*, “Following my *parinirvāṇa*, minor precepts can be discarded as long as the saṃgha makes a unanimous and harmonious decision [on this matter].”<sup>28</sup>
- The Southern tradition’s *Tongye lü* and the *Da banniepan jing* 大般涅槃經 [P. *Mahāparinibbāna Sutta*] in the *Dīghanikāya* states, “Following my *parinibbāna*, should the saṃgha have the need, then it is permissible to discard the minor precepts.”<sup>29</sup>
- *Pinimu jing*, “Following my *parinirvāṇa*, the saṃgha should be assembled to [carefully determine whether] minor precepts are to be discarded.”<sup>30</sup>

<sup>27</sup> For example, see *Shisong lü* [*Ten-recitation Vinaya*], T 1435.23.74b25–26: 「用是雜碎戒為? 半月說戒時, 令諸比丘疑悔惱熱, 憂愁不樂生捨戒心。」

<sup>28</sup> *Shisong lü* [*Ten-recitation Vinaya*], T 1435.23.449b13–14: 「我般涅槃後, 若僧一心和合, 籌量放捨微細戒。」

<sup>29</sup> RZ IV 430–431; see also Vin II 287; “Wubai [jieji] jiandu” [Chapter on the First Council of 500] in *Jiandu* [*Tambaṇṇiya Vinaya, Second Section*], N 2.4.385a4–5: 「阿難! 我滅度後, 僧伽若欲者, 小小戒可捨。」

ChK II 142; see also DN II 154; *Da banniepan jing* [*Mahāparinibbāna Sutta*] in *Changbu jingdian* [*Dīghanikāya*], N 4.7.109a8: 「阿難! 於我滅度後, 僧團若欲者, 小小學處可以捨。」

<sup>30</sup> *Pinimu jing* [*Sūtra on the Vinaya-mātrkā*], T 1463.24.818b3–4: 「吾滅度後, 應集眾僧, 捨微細戒。」

These passages show that discarding the minor precepts is no casual matter, nor does it mean that whole sets of training rules, such as the *pāyattika* rules, should be discarded without reason. The meaning in these passages indicates that the saṃgha must unanimously agree on the decision to discard certain training rules so that the saṃgha can adapt to some new situations that are subject to time, place, and circumstances.

To clarify, let us consider the situations under which Śākyamuni Buddha laid down the monastic precepts. Śākyamuni Buddha set new precepts because a fault was committed by a monastic. That means a situation arose and the Buddha gathered the saṃgha to set the new precept as part of the monastic training rules. Among the training rules, the primary precepts—such as not engaging in sexual activity and not lying<sup>31</sup>—were immediately established as soon as the first incident was reported. All saṃgha members were not permitted to commit such faults thereafter. Then there were situations whereby a monastic committed a fault and only received a reprimand at that time, but no new precept was laid down. However, when similar faults were repeated at a later time, the Buddha saw the need to prohibit the behavior, and thus gathered the saṃgha and set a new precept.

The *Da zhidu lun* says, “The rules laid out in the vinaya are true in the context of this world.”<sup>32</sup> We should bear this point in mind. Each precept was formulated in response to a particular time, place, and person, and mainly related to issues concerning clothing, food, travel, shelter, medicine, and so forth. The purpose of establishing the precepts is to maintain the purity and harmony of the saṃgha as well as to encourage society to develop respect for and faith in them. Therefore, as time, place, and people change, it is to be expected that some of the precepts need to be modified. Even when the Buddha was alive, his approach to the training rules he personally set was to first lay down a rule and then add further restraints or make an exception to a rule and extend applicable conditions to that exception, or set a rule and then discard it, or reinstate a previously discarded rule. Without such an approach, the monastic precepts would be overly rigid and difficult to uphold. Therefore, if the monastic code (training

---

<sup>31</sup> Here, “lying” is specifically referring to major lies about one’s spiritual attainments, with the intention to deceive others.

<sup>32</sup> *Da zhidu lun* [*Exegesis on the Great Perfection of Wisdom*], T 1509.25.66a4–5: 「毘尼中結戒法, 是世界中實。」

rules) is fixed without any flexibility, then undoubtedly it would not be able to cater to changing situations, and the purpose of the training rules would be lost.

Śākyamuni Buddha is an omniscient one who thoroughly understood potential changing situations, and therefore the important responsibility of deciding whether “minor precepts can be discarded” was placed in the hands of the saṃgha. This would allow the saṃgha to gather and address issues caused by minor precepts under a different time, place, and situation. Only in this way can the training rules cater to the reality of the world and not become rigid and obstructive. Nonetheless, those inclined to ascetic practices and who placed emphasis on the precepts thought that discarding minor precepts would destroy the vinaya altogether and cause the saṃgha to discard the entire system of training rules. It would merely satisfy certain individuals and allow them to do whatever they wanted. Such thoughts are poles apart from Śākyamuni Buddha’s intention behind the instruction, “minor precepts can be discarded,” and so it is no surprise that these practitioners vehemently opposed the position [that minor precepts can be discarded.]

According to the *Mishasai bu hexi wufen lü* and others, the saṃgha is allowed to establish new precepts, such as the rules belonging to the *pāyattika*. However, the ascetic monk Upāśena was unwilling to recognize any precepts apart from those established by the Buddha himself.<sup>33</sup> In general, monastics who were inclined toward asceticism and monastics who placed great emphasis on the vinaya firmly believed that stricter training rules were better for the saṃgha. They believed that only by relying on the standards set by the precepts in such a strict way could one cultivate the path with purity. Therefore, the training rules the Buddha laid down and the practices the Buddha permitted (such as ascetic practices) were what these monastics practiced. Perhaps these practitioners felt that their way of cultivation was effective and so unavoidably placed greater weight on their own approach. That is, they believed that this approach was the best and must be followed when learning the Buddha-dharma. With such thinking they concluded: “If the Buddha did not regulate it, then no new precepts should be set. What has already been regulated by precepts must not be violated.”<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> *Mishasai bu hexi wufen lü* [*Mahīśāsaka Vinaya of Five Sections*], T 1421.22.26a26–b1.

<sup>34</sup> For example, see *Mishasai bu hexi wufen lü* [*Mahīśāsaka Vinaya of Five Sections*], T 1421.22.191c16–18 and *Sifen lü* [*Dharmaguptaka Vinaya of Four Sections*], T 1428.22.967b24–26.

With this declaration, the vinaya was regarded as that which only the Buddha could set and the saṃgha had no authority to make any revisions. In the view of the monastics who emphasize the precepts, the training rules are applicable at any time and can be practiced anywhere. Ever since this declaration, there have been no records of any saṃgha permitting the discarding of certain precepts or establishing new ones. If there were incidents whereby new precepts were established [by the saṃgha,] these would only be called “guidelines” and would be loathed by monastics who emphasized the vinaya.

For over 2000 years, within Buddhist circles, [Buddhists] were only permitted to interpret the vinaya and [perhaps] privately change some parts of it. Otherwise, no one could explain the origins of discrepancies in extant vinaya texts of various schools. The saṃghas in different areas could not call a council to draw on the wisdom of members to reach a broad consensus for revisions of rules in the vinaya. Over the passage of time, it has been obvious that many of the precepts have become impractical to uphold. However, Buddhists nominally continue to accept those precepts. When a precept is accepted but not upheld properly, this constitutes a breach. Meanwhile, some monastics view the vinaya as mere formality and thus place no value on the training rules at all. In summary, the vinaya established by Śākyamuni Buddha was meant to be flexible and adaptable to changing circumstances. But once it became inflexible and turned into rigid regulations, the vinaya had a stultifying effect on the application of the Buddha’s teachings. Upon close inspection, this situation undoubtedly stems from the rejection of the Buddha’s permission to discard minor precepts after his *parinirvāṇa*.

When Ānanda conveyed the Buddha’s final message [to the saṃgha,] not only was it rejected, but Ānanda was also subsequently accused of a series of faults. This is a historical fact and need not be further debated. What does need to be discussed further is the precept on disregarding and complaining about the vinaya (training rules) found in vinaya texts across schools of Buddhism. [This precept was established] when Chandaka or the monks belonging to the Group of Six stated, “What is the use of these trivial precepts?”<sup>35</sup> After this, the Tathāgata set this training rule, which belongs to the *pāyattika* set of offences. When the Buddha was alive, he had formulated this training rule and such behavior was regarded as a fault. So why would Śākyamuni Buddha then allow

---

<sup>35</sup> For example, see *Shisong lü* [*Ten-recitations Vinaya*], T 1435.23.74b25: 「用是雜碎戒為？」

the minor precepts to be discarded as part of his final message?

It seems contradictory to the point of being unbelievable that the Buddha would prohibit monastics from saying minor precepts should be discarded, and then allow minor precepts to be discarded as part of his own final message. Concerning this contradiction, could the situation be as follows? Ānanda's faction of monastics, who placed importance on the Dharma, relayed the Buddha's final message that minor precepts could be discarded. But this notion was rejected by the faction founded by Mahākāśyapa, Upāli, and others who emphasized the vinaya. So, the vinaya faction established the *pāyattika* offence in relation to disregarding and complaining about the training rules as a means to prevent the Dharma faction from raising the Buddha's final message again. Logically, this should not be the case, but the contradiction is a fact that is well worth further investigation and contemplation by the vinaya masters.

### 3. The Fault Relating to Women's Ordination

[Among the series of faults Ānanda of which is accused,] some relate to women, and the crucial accusation is that Ānanda implored the Buddha to allow women to be ordained. This matter is recorded in the section called *Bhikṣunī Skandha* in the full version of the vinaya canon of each Buddhist school. This event is also found in the Southern tradition's *Qutan mi* 瞿曇彌 [P. *Gotamīsuttam*, *Gotamī Sutta*] in *Zengzhibu jingdian* 增支部經典 [P. *Aṅguttaranikāya*]<sup>36</sup> and in the *Zhong ahan jing* 中阿含經 [Skt. *Madhyamāgama*]'s *Gautamī Sūtra*.<sup>37</sup> In the vinaya texts and treatises concerning the First Council, there are records of Mahākāśyapa accusing Ānanda of a minor offence because he requested the Buddha to allow women to be ordained.

The events concerning the request are as follows. The Buddha's aunt, Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī [who raised him after the death of his mother, Queen Māya], led a contingent of Śākya women who had traveled a great distance to seek ordination under the Buddha. Despite approaching the Buddha three times to make their request, the Buddha refused. Their intentions were sincere

---

<sup>36</sup> ZK V 194–202; see also AN IV 274–279; *Qutan mi* [*Gotamī Sutta*] in *Zengzhibu jingdian* [*Aṅguttaranikāya*], N 7.23.168a4–174a6.

<sup>37</sup> T 26.1.605a10–607b16.

and pious but due to not being allowed to renounce, they were deeply saddened.

Ānanda saw how grief-stricken the women were and subconsciously felt empathy for them. Consequently, Ānanda went to see the Buddha and made a request on their behalf. According to the *Bhikṣuṇī Skandha*, Ānanda presented the following arguments: 1) Mahāprajāpatī lovingly raised the Buddha as her own child, and the gratitude she showed to the Buddha equals that of his birth mother. To repay such kindness, Ānanda asked that she please be allowed to be ordained. This reason could only apply to Mahāprajāpatī herself. 2) Ānanda asked the Buddha whether it would be possible for women, if they were ordained and cultivated the path, to attain the first fruition and even up to the fourth fruition of arhatship. The Buddha answered that it was possible. Ānanda then requested that the Buddha allow women to be ordained because if they did not renounce, they would not be able to attain the final liberation (fourth fruition). Both reasons are consistently found in the *Tongye lü*, *Mishasai bu hexi wufen lü*, *Sifen lü*, *Mohe sengqi lü*, and the *Āgama* texts, so we can conclude that these were the reasons Ānanda presented when he made the request on their behalf.

In addition, there are two other related narratives [concerning the reasons put forth by Ānanda]. The first is that all buddhas have a fourfold assembly of disciples and therefore the present Buddha should permit females to be ordained. This narrative is found in the texts belonging to the Sarvāstivāda school, such as the *Shisong lü* (as quoted in *Da zhidu lun*), *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye*, and the *Jiashe jie jing*. In contrast, the *Mishasai bu hexi wufen lü* states that none of the buddhas of the past allowed women to be ordained, and this was used as a basis for objection. The *Shisong lü* and the other [Sarvāstivāda] texts mention the fourfold assembly of disciples but do not mention the four fruitions of arhatship. This suggests that the narrative regarding the four fruitions may have been replaced by the narrative concerning the fourfold assembly of disciples as the accounts were passed down. The narrative that the buddhas of the past had a fourfold assembly of disciples is a questionable reason as there is one contradictory account. In addition, this line of argumentation could not have been put forth by Ānanda, given his position.

The second narrative is that Mahāprajāpatī and her contingent of women were from the Śākya clan, and Ānanda took pity on his fellow clan members, making the request on their behalf. However, this narrative is only found in the

*Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye za shi* and the *Jiashe jie jing*, which belong to the Kashmiri Sarvāstivāda school. Such a reason is what they reasonably presumed.

Based on the reasons of repaying the immense kindness of Mahāprajāpati and helping women to be able to attain the final liberation from cyclic existence, Ānanda made repeated requests to the Buddha to permit women to be ordained. Where exactly is there a fault concerning this action? Ānanda never admitted to any fault. However, it is clear that the assembly of monastics led by Mahākāśyapa had other reasons [for supporting this accusation]. In texts such as the *Tongye lü*, there is only mention of Ānanda being reprimanded for pleading to the Tathāgata [to permit women's ordination] and no other details are provided. However, the *Pinimu jing*, *Da zhidu lun*, and the *Zhuanji sanzang ji zazang zhuan*<sup>38</sup> state the following reason: “You committed the fault of causing the existence of the Buddha-dharma to become less than 1000 years.” What this means is that the Tathāgata originally did not permit women to be ordained, but due to Ānanda's plea, he subsequently allowed women to enter the saṃgha. Consequently, the Buddha-dharma would decline earlier, which is an undesirable result.

In the *Pinimu jing*, there is a list of ten main reasons that Ānanda is at fault. According to the sūtra, in general, allowing women to be ordained will cause lay followers to reduce their respect for and offerings to the saṃgha, and the monks will appear less dignified. In addition, the righteous Dharma teachings would not remain long.<sup>39</sup> From the sūtra and vinaya texts, it is obvious that the quality of the saṃgha members toward the Buddha's later years in life was not as wholesome as during the Buddha's younger years.

Generally, we see that more and more precept rules were established as the practice of determination to attain enlightenment declined. Mahākāśyapa once asked the Buddha about this situation (see *Samyuttanikāya* 16.13 and *Za*

<sup>38</sup> *Pinimu jing* [*Sūtra on the Vinaya-mātrkā*], T 1463.24.818c4–6: 「十者, 若女人不出家者, 佛之正法應住千年, 今減五百年。」 *Da zhidu lun* [*Exegesis on the Great Perfection of Wisdom*], T 1509.25.68a14–17: 「佛意不欲聽女人出家, 汝懇勸請, 佛聽為道; 以是故, 佛之正法五百歲而衰微。」 *Zhuanji sanzang ji zazang zhuan* [*Record on the Collection of the Tripiṭaka and the Kṣudraka-piṭaka*], T 2026.49.2a13–16: 「阿難白曰 何耶上座 我於三尊 有何過失 迦葉答曰 弟欲知耶 汝於佛眾 有大過失 坐汝佛法 減於千歲 由汝勸佛 度於母人」。

<sup>39</sup> *Pinimu jing* [*Sūtra on the Vinaya-mātrkā*], T 1463.24.803b7–9: 「吾所以不聽女人出家者, 如世人家男少女多, 家業必壞。出家法中若有女人, 必壞正法, 不得久住。」



*ahan jing* 雜阿含經 [Skt. *Samyuktāgama*] SA 32.906).<sup>40</sup> The situation was likely due to the gradual increase in Buddhism's popularity as it spread, and to the ease of acquiring offerings from lay followers. As a result, some people joined the saṃgha with improper motives, which led to an increase in saṃgha membership, but the quality of the members became impure. At the same time, allowing women to be ordained gave rise to various issues within the saṃgha, which also led to quite a few undesirable effects. The senior monks inclined toward ascetic practices and those who focused on the vinaya attributed these problems to allowing women to enter the saṃgha, and so placed the blame on Ānanda. For example, in texts such as the *Shisong lü*, Mahākāśyapa said several times that "I do not blame you all (bhikṣuṇī), I blame Ānanda."<sup>41</sup> The meaning of this quote is that if it were not for Ānanda's plea to the Buddha, women would not be allowed to enter the saṃgha, and thus all these related problems would not exist. Accordingly, would not the saṃgha be able to practice in purity and the righteous Dharma would last longer? The quality of the saṃgha members became mixed and this created a poor image of the saṃgha among the general public. The saṃgha led by Mahākāśyapa ascribed the cause of these problems to the bhikṣuṇī assembly, and this was the reason Ānanda was reprimanded.

The full versions of vinaya texts from the various schools of Buddhism are consistent in stating that allowing women to be ordained would cause the Buddha's teachings to decline earlier. Moreover, these texts describe this as a prediction ascribed to the Buddha himself. For example, the *Sifen lü* says:

Ānanda! It is like this simile. In a householder's family where there are many women and few men, it is to be expected that the family will decline.... Likewise, there is another simile. Someone has a good paddy field but all the crops get damaged by frost or hail. Similarly, Ānanda, now that women have gone forth into the Buddha-dharma and received the full monastic precepts, the true Dharma will not last as long.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>40</sup> SK II 326–328; see also SN II, 223–225; *Za ahan jing* [*Samyuktāgama*], T 99.2.226b25–227a1.

<sup>41</sup> *Shisong lü* [*Ten-recitation Vinaya*], T 1435.23.291a21–294c8: 「我不責汝，我責阿難。」

<sup>42</sup> *Sifen lü* [*Dharmaguptaka Vinaya of Four Sections*], T 1428.22.923a1–6: 「譬如，阿難！有長者家男少女多，則知其家衰微。如是，阿難！若女人在佛法中出家受大戒，則令佛法不久。又如好稻田而被霜雹即時破壞。如是，阿難！若女人在佛法中出家受大戒，即令佛法不久。」

The first simile is like the Chinese notion: when yin flourishes, yang declines. It may be undesirable for the saṃgha to have more women than men. However, this should not be used as a reason for preventing women from being ordained. Simply pleading with the Buddha to allow women to be ordained does not equate to more women than men seeking renunciation. As for the second simile, the rice plants represent the monks, and the frost and hail represent the nuns (note that the version of this story in the *Tongye lü* uses pathogens). But are the monks really like strong and healthy seedlings, and women like damaging frost, hail, or pathogens? If we look at the very severe offenses set for the monks—that is, the four primary precepts (*pārājika*) and thirteen secondary precepts (*saṃghāvaśeṣa*)—none of these are related to nuns or women, yet monks still contravene these precepts. Therefore, these two similes are merely a reflection of ancient societies in which women were generally regarded as inferior, or even as a source of problems, while men were given dominance.

The argument that the Buddha originally did not allow women to be ordained because he regarded women as pathogens is illogical. If the Buddha clearly knew that women were like pathogens, would he still have allowed such pathogens to be transmitted into a healthy paddy field? There is no denying that the ordination of women brought with it quite a few problems and, of course, the Buddha had to consider the matter thoroughly. In the society of that time, where men were considered superior and women inferior, women experienced discrimination. According to the records in the vinaya texts, the female saṃgha had a much harder time seeking alms and financial support compared to the male saṃgha. Moreover, when it came to social interaction, lodgings, education, and personal safety, women faced more problems than men. In particular, the mental activity of affection in women (motherly love, etc.) is stronger, and generally women are more emotional than rational. They also have less tolerance, and are physically weaker than men. Collectively, these general characteristics [of women] would unavoidably introduce challenges to the male saṃgha. Nevertheless, the Buddha did eventually agree to allow women to be ordained. This is because where a problem arises, it should be resolved rather than be cursed. Under the Buddha's spirit of universal great compassion, women were allowed to be ordained and gained equal opportunity to cultivate the path and attain liberation.

From the viewpoint of the ascetically oriented Mahākāśyapa and the

vinaya masters such as Upāli, the statement that “allowing the ordination of women will reduce the duration of the righteous Dharma’s existence by 500 years” is reasonable. That is, when confronted with the decline in the quality of the saṃgha members, they attributed its cause to the ordination of women, and then predicted that the Buddha-dharma would not exist for long. However, the vinaya masters ascribed this prediction to the Buddha himself. Consequently, the description of this matter has been the subject of confusion as the narratives were passed down. Based on sūtra and vinaya texts, there are three different narratives:

1. The first narrative is that Ānanda repeatedly pleaded with the Buddha [to allow women to be ordained] and the Buddha finally agreed. Ānanda then informed Mahāprajāpatī that the request to permit women to enter the saṃgha had been granted. The Buddha then predicted that with the ordination of women the duration of the righteous Dharma’s presence would reduce by 500 years. Ānanda did not react to this message at all. This narrative is found in the *Tongye lü* and the *Gotamī Sutta* of the *Aṅguttaranikāya*,<sup>43</sup> both belonging to the Southern tradition.
2. The second narrative is the same as the one above; however, after Ānanda heard the Buddha’s prediction he addressed the Buddha with much pain and sorrow. “Blessed One! Having never before heard such a prediction, I pleaded with you to allow women to renounce and take the full monastic precepts. Had I have known about this in advance, I surely would not have made such repeated requests.”<sup>44</sup> This version is found in the *Mishasai bu hexi wufen lü*. [The addition of Ānanda’s reaction is because] it is unlikely that Ānanda would have not reacted after hearing the prediction. But if the situation was as recorded in the *Mishasai bu hexi wufen lü*, then at the First Council, Ānanda would

<sup>43</sup> RZ 382; see also Vin II 256 ; “Biqiuni Jiandu” [Chapter on *Bhiksunis*] in *Jiandu* [*Tamba-panṇiya Vinaya, Second Section*], N 2.4.342a9–343a2.

ZK V 194–202; see also AN IV 274–279 (8.51); *Qutan mi* [*Gotamī Sutta*] in *Zengzhibu jing-dian* [*Aṅguttaranikāya*], N 7.23.168a4–174a6.

<sup>44</sup> *Mishasai bu hexi wufen lü* [*Mahīśāsaka Vinaya of Five Sections*], T 1421.22.186a22–24: 「世尊!我先不聞、不知此法,求聽女人出家受具足戒。若我先知,豈當三請?」

have willingly admitted his fault, but why [do the records say] he did not admit fault?

3. The third narrative is that when Ānanda pleaded with the Buddha, the Buddha informed him that allowing women to be ordained would result in the righteous Dharma not lasting as long as anticipated. Further, the Buddha used two similes to explain. Ānanda disregarded this information, however, and persisted with his plea. It was after this that the Buddha agreed. This version is found in the *Sifen lü* and *Zhong ahan jing's Gautamī Sūtra*.<sup>45</sup> Logically speaking, if after knowing the consequences Ānanda persisted in making his plea to the Buddha, then does this sound like the Ānanda we know, who respects and honors the Buddha and Dharma, the one who is most learned and sharp-witted?

In fact, if the Buddha revealed the prediction during the event where Ānanda pleaded to allow women to be ordained, no matter when he revealed the prediction during that event, it would still present issues of logic. No matter where the vinaya masters place the Buddha's prediction in the sequence of the narrative, it is out of place. But they think this piece must be included in the story. Consequently, regardless of whether it is placed before or after [the Buddha's permission,] the contradiction remains.

Ānanda pleaded with the Buddha to permit women's ordination and was consequently reprimanded by Mahākāśyapa. The reason for the reprimand is not that straightforward. Let us look at another aspect that relates to Mahākāśyapa himself. Mahākāśyapa came from a wealthy and noble family, and his personality innately had no interest in women. Although he once reluctantly entered into a marriage, the relationship was merely in name and the marriage was never consummated. Eventually he renounced the home life. This information can be found in texts such as the Southern tradition's *Khuddaka Nikāya* [Minor Discourses] and *Theragāthā* [Discourses of the Senior Monks], as well as the Northern School's *Bhikṣuṇī Vinaya*. [The Buddhist scriptures reveal that] within Buddhist circles, Mahākāśyapa's relationship with some bhikṣuṇī saṃghas was quite poor, and the reason may be due to

---

<sup>45</sup> *Sifen lü* [Dharmaguptaka Vinaya of Four Sections], T 1428.22.922c28–923a6; *Zhong ahan jing* [Madhyamāgama], T 26.1.605a8–607b16.

his personal characteristics. For example, some bhikṣuṇī saṃghas called him a heretic,<sup>46</sup> a little inferior bhikṣu (meaning he is not great like an elephant [king]).<sup>47</sup> Also, those nuns compared his Dharma teachings to “a needle peddler trying to sell a needle to the needle maker,” meaning he was trying to show off in front of experts.<sup>48</sup> The bhikṣuṇī saṃgha also intentionally made things difficult for him, such that he experienced innumerable hardships.<sup>49</sup> Facing these situations, Mahākāśyapa was helpless and could only say, “I do not blame you all (bhikṣuṇī), I blame Ānanda.” In general, Mahākāśyapa’s relationship with the bhikṣuṇī saṃgha was strained. At the gathering of the First Council, when Ānanda relayed the instruction that minor precepts could be discarded, this unavoidably triggered many grievances from the past that were collectively brought up, and charges were laid against Ānanda.

Ānanda did not admit to any fault but for the sake of the saṃgha’s harmony and not wanting to stir up unrest, he repented to the saṃgha at the First Council. If this situation befell someone else, they may have retorted and said: *On the matter of women’s ordination, I pleaded with the Buddha and the Buddha also agreed. All this happened some twenty years ago. If you thought I was at fault, then why did you not report me to the saṃgha when the Buddha was alive? It is just a few months since the Buddha entered parinirvāṇa and you now choose to settle all your old scores?* Had Ānanda retorted along these lines, then perhaps the golden ascetic (Mahākāśyapa) would have had little choice but to flash a knowing smile of a different type.

<sup>46</sup> See SK 320–321; SN II 219; *Za ahan jing* [*Samyuktāgama*], T 99.2.303a12–16; *Shisong lü* [*Ten-recitation Vinaya*], T 1435.23.291a17–23.

<sup>47</sup> *Shisong lü* [*Ten-recitation Vinaya*], T 1435.23.85b8–c3.

<sup>48</sup> SK 316; see also SN II 215–216; *Za ahan jing* [*Samyuktāgama*], T 99.2.302b12–22: 「譬如販針兒於針師家賣。」

<sup>49</sup> Various examples can be found in the *Shisong lü* [*Ten-recitation Vinaya*] and *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye za shi* [*Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya on Miscellaneous Matters*]. Translator’s note: An example from the *Shisong lü* [*Ten-recitation Vinaya*] is of a bhikṣuṇī intentionally walking slowly in front of Mahākāśyapa. When he asked her to either walk faster or move aside, she scolded him by calling him a heretic and questioned why he was in such a rush (T 1435.23.291a17–23). An example from the *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye za shi* [*Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya on Miscellaneous Matters*] is that a bhikṣuṇī sees Mahākāśyapa standing on a bridge over flood waters and then stomps on the bridge, causing him to fall into the water (T 1451.24.359b28–c7).

## 4. The Other Faults Relating to Women

The two other accusations leveled at Ānanda in relation to women also concern his failure to properly carry out his duties as the Buddha's personal attendant.

### The Fault of Allowing Women to Pay Respect First and Sully the Buddha's Feet with Tears

One accusation, according to the *Tongye lü*, is that following the Buddha's *parinibbāna*, Ānanda allowed women to pay respect to the Buddha's relics first. At that time, women were grieving and weeping, and their tears sullied the Buddha's feet.<sup>50</sup> This narrative is also found in the *Da banniepan jing* 大般涅槃經 [Skt. *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*], translated by Faxian 法顯 (337–422).<sup>51</sup> This fault has two aspects. The other scriptural references concerning this incident feature only one aspect or the other.

For example, the *Mishasai bu hexi wufen lü* only states that “Ānanda allowed women to be the first to pay homage,”<sup>52</sup> while the *Sifen lü*, the *Youxing jing* 遊行經 [*Sūtra on Buddha's Final Journey*] in the *Dīrghāgama*, and the *Bannihuan jing* 般泥洹經 [Skt. *Parinirvāṇasūtra*, *Parinirvāṇa Sūtra*] all state that “he failed to prevent women from shedding tears on the Buddha's feet.”<sup>53</sup> The story of this incident is that when the Mallas tribe of Kuśinagara came to pay their final respects to the Buddha, Ānanda had the men moved backward so the women could pay their respects first. In the *Mishasai bu hexi wufen lü*, it states that Ānanda's explanation was that “he worried the women would not be able to return to the city before dark.”<sup>54</sup> In the *Da banniepan jing*, the reason

<sup>50</sup> RZ IV 432; see also Vin II 289; “Wubai [jieji] jiandu” [Chapter on the First Council of 500] in *Jiandu* [*Tambapaṇṇiya Vinaya*, *Second Section*], N 2.4.386a12.

<sup>51</sup> T 7.1.206c29–207a8.

<sup>52</sup> *Mishasai bu hexi wufen lü* [*Mahīśāsaka Vinaya of Five Sections*], T 1421.22.191c1–2: 「汝聽女人先禮舍利。」

<sup>53</sup> *Sifen lü* [*Dharmaguptaka Vinaya of Four Sections*], T 1428.22.966c6–8: 「阿難答言：『大德迦葉！女人心軟，前禮佛時泣淚墮上，手捉汚世尊足。』」

*Youxing jing* [*Sūtra on Buddha's Final Journey*] in *Chang ahan jing* [*Dīrghāgama*], T 1.1.28c27–29a2: 「時，大迦葉適向香龕。於時，佛身從重櫛內雙出兩足，足有異色。迦葉見已，怪問阿難：『佛身金色，足何故異？』阿難報曰：『向者，有一老母悲哀而前手撫佛足，淚墮其上，故色異耳。』」

*Bannihuan jing* [*Parinirvāṇa Sūtra*], T 6.1.189c4–7: 「於是佛尸從重棺裏雙出兩足，一切見者莫不歡喜。迦葉稽首作禮，見佛足上而有異色，仰問阿難：『佛身金色，是何故異？』阿難答言：『有羸老母，稽首佛足，墮淚其上，故異色耳。』」

is that “women are weaker [than men and] so unlikely to get in line earlier.”<sup>55</sup> Therefore, Ānanda decided to call upon everyone to let the women pay their respects first, which is similar to the modern-day spirit of “ladies first.”

In general, when facing danger, the first to be moved out of harm’s way are women and children, in which case Ānanda’s thinking is quite reasonable. The crowd of those wanting to pay their respects was huge, so it would be difficult for the women to make their way forward. In addition, what if the women returned home late due to waiting to pay their last respects to the Buddha, and the women’s children were crying for their mothers? Moreover, it might not have been safe for women to travel late at night. With these considerations in mind, Ānanda’s decision to let the women pay their respects before the men was a wise choice. But Mahākāśyapa, representing the patriarchal thinking of the time, felt that such a decision was inappropriate, and therefore raised this issue to reprimand Ānanda.

The other aspect of this accusation concerns women paying respects to the Buddha (which usually involves touching the Buddha’s feet with one’s head), and then sullyng the Buddha’s feet with their tears. According to texts such as the *Youxing jing* in the *Dirghāgama*, when Mahākāśyapa came to pay respects to the Buddha’s relics, he saw blemishes on the Buddha’s feet and was very displeased at this sight. Although the cause may have been due to women being more emotional than men and their tears falling on the Buddha’s feet, ultimately it can be argued that Ānanda, as the Buddha’s personal attendant, failed in his duty. However, the grand ceremony of Buddha’s *parinirvāṇa* was all managed by Ānanda, and so an instance of inattention is not unreasonable. This outcome is not perfect, but forgivable.

### The Fault of Allowing Women to See the Buddha’s Private Parts

The other accusation is that, after the Buddha’s *parinirvāṇa*, Ānanda allowed women to see the Buddha’s private parts. This narrative is found in the *Shisong lü* (quoted in the *Da zhidu lun*), the *Mohe sengqi lü*, the *Genben shuoyiqiyoubu pinaiye za shi*, and the *Jiashe jie jing*. This accusation is really the same event as

---

<sup>54</sup> *Mishasai bu hexi wufen lü* [*Mahīśāsaka Vinaya of Five Sections*], T 1421.22.191c2–4: 「我非欲使女人先禮舍利, 恐其日暮不得入城, 是以聽之。」

<sup>55</sup> *Da banniepan jing* [*Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*], T 7.1.206c29–207a2: 「若令大眾同時進者, 女人羸弱, 不必得前。」

the prior accusation, but just a different narrative.

In terms of the vinaya texts on this event, we can turn to the Sarvāstivāda school, which was dominant in the area around Mathurā and the upstream areas of the Ganges River. They adopted the *Shisong lü* as their base vinaya text, which records that Ānanda allowed women to see the Buddha's private parts but says nothing about women shedding tears on the Buddha's feet.<sup>56</sup> The Sthavira school was popular in Pāṭaliputra and the downstream areas of the Ganges River. They took the *Tongye lü* or the *Mishasai bu hexi wufen lü* as their base vinaya text. These texts mention women being allowed to pay respects first and their tears sullied the Buddha's feet, but say nothing about Ānanda allowing women to see the Buddha's private parts. This evidence shows the two accusations were not separate events but rather different narratives adopted by different Buddhist schools.

Nonetheless, the two narratives were consulted in later scriptural texts. For example, the new edited vinaya texts of the (Kashmiri) Sarvāstivāda school, the *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye za shi*, adopted both narratives and therefore two separate faults are presented.<sup>57</sup> Logically speaking, it is indeed possible that Ānanda let women pay their respect first and that their tears sullied the Buddha's feet. However, the incident in which Ānanda allowed women to see the Buddha's private parts went too far. According to the *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye za shi*, Ānanda displayed the Buddha's golden body and private parts to women. Note that this action is described differently in some other narratives, which say Ānanda did not prevent women from paying respects to the Buddha. Concerning the latter action, it is difficult to believe that Ānanda would have done this intentionally.

Care should be exercised with regard to narratives that display significant variations between the texts of the different schools. Though the scriptural texts present different narratives, within the content of the story there must be something true. The fact is likely to be that the women were allowed to pay their respects first and that their tears sullied the Buddha's feet. Allowing women to pay respects first would naturally have not been well-received by Mahākāśyapa and his followers.

---

<sup>56</sup> *Shisong lü* [*Ten-recitation Vinaya*], T 1435.23.449c12–16.

<sup>57</sup> *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye za shi* [*Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya on Miscellaneous Matters*], T 1451.24.405b25–c2.



## 5. The Faults Relating to Ānanda's Failure as the Buddha's Attendant

The next three faults for which Ānanda was censured relate to failures in his duties as the Buddha's attendant. Three months prior to the Buddha's *parinirvāṇa*, the Buddha set off from Vaiśālī for Kuśinagara, where he later entered *parinirvāṇa*. All this time, Ānanda was by his side as his attendant. The Buddha entered *parinirvāṇa* at Kuśinagara—but how could this be? Although it is known that *parinirvāṇa* is inevitable, when faced with the Buddha's *parinirvāṇa*, many of the sages felt sorrow, and more or less blamed Ānanda for not taking good care of the Buddha. Therefore, [the fact that] Mahākāśyapa pointed out the following three incidents can be considered emotionally reasonable. Whether Ānanda was at fault is another matter.

### The Fault of Not Requesting the Buddha to Remain in the World

The first accusation is that Ānanda did not ask the Buddha to remain in the world. All the related scriptural texts are consistent in saying that when the Buddha was at Vaiśālī, he and Ānanda went to the nearby Cāpāla Cave monastery and meditated there. The Buddha told Ānanda that in this world the location of Vaiśālī and its surrounding areas are very peaceful and comfortable. Anyone who skillfully cultivates and accomplishes the practice of the four meditative concentrations of supernatural power can prolong their lifespan by one eon or more. The Buddha then said that he had skillfully cultivated and accomplished the practice of the four meditative concentrations of supernatural power. These few sentences by the Buddha implied that those who loathe cyclical existence perceive the world inaccurately, and believe that one must leave this world as soon as possible.

The Buddha, by contrast, could have remained in this world for a much longer time. Had Ānanda [understood the hint and] requested the Buddha to remain in the world, then the Buddha would have done so. Even though the Buddha repeated this message three times, Ānanda did not react accordingly, and said nothing at all. Shortly afterwards, Māra came to see the Buddha. In the past, Māra had several times requested the Buddha to enter *parinirvāṇa*. But the Buddha had not agreed, because he had to wait until the fourfold assembly of disciples was well established in their practices, and the Buddha-dharma had spread far and wide. Now, Māra again raised the matter

and the Buddha agreed. Accordingly, the Buddha decided to relinquish his lifeforce and set the time of his *parinirvāṇa* to be three months hence. Upon learning about this, Ānanda immediately implored the Buddha to remain in the world, but he was too late. The Buddha explained to Ānanda that he had already promised Māra and he had to hold true to his word. Why did Ānanda not make the request to the Buddha earlier? The Buddha explained that Ānanda's mind was obstructed by Māra such that he could not understand the hint in the Buddha's message. This is the reason Ānanda did not know to request the Buddha to remain in this world. This is how the sequence of events is recorded.

The meaning behind the events in this story have far-reaching and profound implications and influence. First, it implies that even the sages (let alone ordinary unenlightened practitioners) have aspects of contradiction between their rationality and emotions. In terms of manifested phenomena, all sages know that all conditioned things are impermanent, and that whatever comes into being will also pass away. But when facing the Buddha's *parinirvāṇa*, even the sages unavoidably experienced sorrow, despair, and presumedly felt that the Buddha should not have entered *parinirvāṇa* in that way.

In terms of the absolute truth, entering *parinirvāṇa* is to transcend life and death, and to abide in cessation, and so there is no need to feel grief. But when facing this factual worldly situation, the sages still experienced sorrow. The contradiction between rationality and emotion is clearly highlighted in the Mahāyāna *Da banniepan jing*, where Cunda again and again pleaded with the Buddha not to enter *parinirvāṇa*, even though he knew that the Buddha had the *vajra* body, which is permanent and fixed. Therefore, the Buddha's *parinirvāṇa* caused complications in the minds of the disciples, whereby their emotions were mixed with rationality. [The situation] called to question: *Did the Buddha enter parinirvāṇa just like that? The Buddha should not have entered parinirvāṇa like that.* The issue of the Buddha's *parinirvāṇa* remained deeply in the minds of his disciples.

Second, the practice of the four meditative concentrations of supernatural power are meditative states that can give rise to supernatural powers. The cultivation of this practice can extend one's lifespan, and this concept is generally accepted within the Buddhist community. Accordingly, we see teachings mentioning that arhats enter the apex of concentration to extend their lifespan, and attaining meditative concentration of cessation enables one to remain in this

world.<sup>58</sup> It is true that with the power of deep meditative concentration someone can extend their lifespan. Then the question becomes why the Buddha entered *parinirvāṇa* instead of remaining in this world, given that he had cultivated and accomplished the practice of the four meditative concentrations of supernatural power and possessed very profound meditative concentration?

Third, the narrative includes the act of relinquishing lifeforce, which implies that the Buddha's lifespan originally was much longer and that he could have remained in this world and not entered *parinirvāṇa* so early. This idea [influenced] the belief that Buddha's lifespan was eons long, and this became a general belief held by the Buddha's disciples.

Fourth, Māra had always tried to hinder the Buddha's cultivation of the path to prevent him from attaining Buddhahood and to hamper his efforts to spread the Dharma. Māra is one who does not want the Buddha and the Dharma to exist in this world. The narrative about how Māra obstructed the Buddha is as follows. The Buddha originally had a very long lifespan and possessed very profound meditative abilities, and so he could have and should have remained in this world. But he did not do so, and this can be said to have fulfilled Māra's long-cherished wish. Why would the Buddha grant Māra's wish? Ānanda was attending to the Buddha day and night, but what was he doing? The consensus among the Buddha's disciples was that Ānanda did not request the Buddha to remain in this world and so the Tathāgata entered *parinirvāṇa*. Due to the Buddha's *parinirvāṇa*, this consensus immediately spread among his followers and became a fact.

This is similar to the situation in Christianity after Jesus died and his disciples began to entertain the hope that he would be resurrected, which soon became a fact. Originally, the Buddha entering *parinirvāṇa* only gave rise to the notion that the Buddha should not have entered *parinirvāṇa* like that, which was merely a wish in the minds of Buddha's disciples. But once this became a common consensus, Ānanda's fault became a major issue. Because he did not request the Buddha to remain in this world, he had to be held responsible for the Tathāgata's early entrance into *parinirvāṇa*. At the time, Ānanda refuted

---

<sup>58</sup> An example of such a teaching can be found in the *Apidamo Fazhi lun* 阿毘達磨發智論 [Skt. *Jñānaprasthāna*], T 26.1544.981a12–17: 「云何苾芻留多壽行?答: 謂阿羅漢成就神通, 得心自在。若於僧眾, 若別人所, 以衣以鉢, 或以隨一沙門命緣眾具布施。施已發願, 即入邊際第四靜慮。從定起已, 心念口言: 『諸我能感富異熟業, 願此轉招壽異熟果。』時, 彼能招富異熟業則轉能招壽異熟果。」

this with the reason that he had been blinded by Māra and so did not admit to the fault. This effectively means that at the time [the Buddha gave him the message], he was unable to get the hint. Why should this inability be a fault? The *Bannihuan jing* says it convincingly: “Ānanda rose from his seat and came down. Then he said that the Buddha predicted Maitreya as the next buddha, and those who have already encountered the Dharma will [follow his teaching and] attain awakening. Should Śākyamuni Buddha remain in the world, what would be the point of Maitreya becoming a buddha?”<sup>59</sup> This is the unique way in which Ānanda retorted—found only in this scripture—and provides a good reason for the Buddha’s entrance into *parinirvāṇa*. Perhaps, it suggests, that as the narrative was passed down, some felt that Mahākāśyapa accusing Ānanda of this fault was excessive.

### The Fault of Not Providing the Buddha with Water When He Asked

The second fault is that Ānanda did not provide water when the Buddha asked for it. The vinaya texts, such as the *Mishasai bu hexi wufen lü*, all (except for the *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye za shi*) consistently state that Mahākāśyapa scolded Ānanda: “Why did you not fetch water for the Buddha when he requested it three times?”<sup>60</sup> Amongst the list of accusations leveled at Ānanda, this is the most understandable.

According to the Southern tradition’s *Da banniepan jing* in the *Dīghanikāya* and the Chinese translation of the *Youxing jing* in the *Dīrghāgama*, this story is as follows. After the Buddha accepted the offering from Cunda (roughly the day prior to Buddha’s *parinirvāṇa*), the Buddha developed a gastrointestinal illness and was passing blood on the way to Kuśinagara. The weather was hot and the Buddha was thirsty and exhausted. They rested near a river. At that time, they were also near the Krakūṣṭha River. The Buddha then asked Ānanda to fetch him some water for drinking and for washing (bathing is the best way to cool down). Because 500 carts were crossing the upstream stretch of that river, the water was turbid. Therefore, Ānanda told the Buddha to wait until they moved further to the Krakūṣṭha River, where the water was clean enough

---

<sup>59</sup> *Bannihuan jing* [*Parinirvāṇa Sūtra*], T 6.1.191a13–15: 「阿難下言:『佛說彌勒,當下作佛,始入法者,應從彼成;設自留者,如彌勒何?』」

<sup>60</sup> *Mishasai bu hexi wufen lü* [*Mahīśāsaka Vinaya of Five Sections*], T 1421.22.191b25–26: 「佛昔從汝三反索水,汝竟不奉!」

for drinking. Not giving a drink to someone who is sick and very thirsty when they need it is highly inconsiderate.<sup>61</sup>

Understandably, this could be viewed as disrespect from the attendant and a failure in his duty. But Ānanda considered the water to be too dirty to consume, so how could he have offered such water to the Buddha for drinking? The Buddha was expected to enter *parinirvāṇa* shortly, so ordinary people may have thought that regardless of the potability of the water, if the Buddha wanted a drink, he should have been given one. Thus, no matter what, Ānanda was at fault.

According to the narrative in the vinaya texts, Ānanda's decision to not provide water at that time, and to not even fetch water, was wrong. The reason is that although there was no clean water, fetching some dirty water would be better than nothing, as "by the superpowers of the Buddha, or the blessings of the heavenly beings, that [dirty] water could have been transformed into clean water."<sup>62</sup> Over time, this incident about Ānanda not providing water has undergone some changes as the narrative was passed down. In the *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye za shi*, *Fo bannihuan jing*, and the *Bannihuan jing*,<sup>63</sup> the narrative is that Ānanda fetched some dirty water and the Buddha only used it for bathing. Nonetheless, offering dirty water to the Buddha was of course not right, and Mahākāśyapa reprimanded Ānanda for this, saying: "Why did you not take out the alms bowl and raise it to the sky, the heavenly beings would have poured the water of the eight virtues into the bowl?"<sup>64</sup> To sum up, this event was likely a matter of not bringing water or of offering some turbid water for bathing. But from a different perspective, given the Buddha's supernatural

---

<sup>61</sup> See ChK II 106–107; DN II 128–129; *Youxing jing* [*Sūtra on Buddha's Final Journey*] in *Chang ahan jing* [*Dīrghāgama*], T 1.1.19c13–17; *Da banniepan jing* [*Mahāparinibbāna Sutta*] in *Changbu jingdian* [*Dīghanikāya*], N 4.7.81a3–7.

<sup>62</sup> *Sifen lü* [*Dharmaguptaka Vinaya of Four Sections*], T 1428.22.967c21–22: 「若佛威神或復諸天能令水清淨。」

*Da zhidu lun* [*Exegesis on the Great Perfection of Wisdom*], T 1509.25.68a23–25: 「正使水濁，佛有大神力，能令大海濁水清淨。」

<sup>63</sup> *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye za shi* [*Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya on Miscellaneous Matters*], T 1451.24.405a25–28; *Fo bannihuan jing* [*Sūtra on Buddha's Parinirvāṇa*], T 5.1.168a21–25; *Bannihuan jing* [*Parinirvāṇa Sūtra*], T 6.1.183c8–10.

<sup>64</sup> *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye za shi* [*Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya on Miscellaneous Matters*], T 1451.24.405a29–b2: 「當爾之時，何不仰鉢向空，諸天自注八功德水置汝鉢中？」

powers and the protection of the heavenly beings, how could it be possible that the Buddha would not have received clean water when he needed it? Therefore, the *Da banniepan jing* in the *Dīghanikāya* says that the Buddha requested water three times, after which Ānanda reluctantly fetched water, and when he saw that the river was extremely clean, he praised the Buddha's powers.<sup>65</sup> The *Youxing jing* in the *Dīrghāgama* says that when Ānanda failed to bring water, the spirits of the snowy mountains provided a bowl of clean water. So, regardless of Ānanda's failure to fetch water time and again, the Buddha was still able to drink clean water.<sup>66</sup> This outcome should be more appealing to the wishes of the Buddha's followers.

### The Fault of Treading on the Buddha's Robe

The third accusation is the fault of treading on the Buddha's robe. This incident is recounted with little difference in the texts of the various Buddhist schools. The issue here is straightforward and merely a situation of Ānanda being scolded for showing a lack of respect. The story is that Ānanda stepped on the Buddha's outer robe (Skt. *saṃghāṭī*) or bathing robe while folding it (some versions say while stitching or washing it). Such an action is considered disrespectful. Ānanda explains that at the time there was no one around to help him, and a gust of wind picked up the robe. Therefore, he had no option but to step on it [to prevent it from flying away]. The full narrative of this incident is yet to be found in scriptural texts. But this is a minor issue. Perhaps this incident took place shortly before the Buddha's *parinirvāṇa* [and so was revealed at the First Council but not recorded in scriptures]. As for the task of folding the Buddha's robes, this is one of the ways in which Ānanda served the Buddha daily [and stepping on the Buddha's robe may have occurred before then but was not regarded as a fault when the Buddha was alive].

---

<sup>65</sup> ChK II 105–108; see also DN II 128–129; *Da banniepan jing* [*Mahāparinibbāna Sutta*] in *Changbu jingdian* [*Dīghanikāya*], N 4.7.81a03–82a7.

<sup>66</sup> *Youxing jing* [*Sūtra on Buddha's Final Journey*] in *Chang ahan jing* [*Dīrghāgama*], T 1.1.19c17–18.

## 6. Other Faults

In the narratives passed down, there are a few more accusations against Ānanda, but these appear only in the texts belonging to the tradition of a certain area and are thus less credible.

### The Fault of Refusing to Be the Buddha's Attendant

At first, the Buddha wanted Ānanda to be his personal attendant but Ānanda declined. The *Sifen lü* says, “the World Honored One asked you three times to be his personal attendant yet you refused. Therefore, you are guilty of a minor offence.”<sup>67</sup> This incident is also found in texts such as the *Shizhe jing* 侍者經 [*Attendant Sūtra*] in the *Madhyamāgama*, and the *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye poseng shi* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶破僧事 [*Mūlasarvāstivādinaya on the Matter of Schism in the Saṃgha*].<sup>68</sup> The position of being the Buddha's personal attendant was not an easy job. It is reasonable that Ānanda would have taken some time to consider the offer. In the end, Ānanda accepted the role only after the Buddha agreed to three conditions. The Buddha praised Ānanda for exercising thoughtful consideration, so how could this be considered a fault?

### The Fault of Excusing a Mistake Improperly

The *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye za shi* states that “While the Buddha was still alive he presented a simile and you responded with a different interpreta-

---

<sup>67</sup> *Sifen lü* [*Dharmaguptaka Vinaya of Four Sections*], T 1428.22.967c3–4: 「汝令世尊三反請汝作供養人, 而言不作, 得突吉羅罪。」

<sup>68</sup> *Shizhe jing* [*Attendant Sūtra*] in *Zhong ahan jing* [*Madhyamāgama*], T 26.1.472b22–29; *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye poseng shi* [*Mūlasarvāstivādinaya on the Matter of Schism in the Saṃgha*], T 1450.24.167a1–3. Translator's note: the incident where Ānanda initially refused to be the Buddha's attendant does not seem clear in the *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye poseng shi* [*Mūlasarvāstivādinaya on the Matter of Schism in the Saṃgha*]. This text says that Śāriputra and Mahāmaudgalyāyana persuaded and appealed to Ānanda to be the Buddha's attendant, and after that persuasion and appeal, Ānanda accepted the task. Perhaps it is the description “persuaded and appealed” (*quanqing* 勸請) that causes Venerable Yinshun to have the understanding that Ānanda initially refused to be the Buddha's attendant. If Ānanda had accepted the task immediately when Śāriputra and Mahāmaudgalyāyana first mentioned the matter, then they would not have had to persuade and appeal to Ānanda to accept the role of being the Buddha's attendant.

tion. This is the third fault.”<sup>69</sup> It is unclear what this event relates to. However, in the *Jiashe jie jing*, there is a parallel account: “When the World Honored One reprimanded you, you responded with harsh words that you took the blame for others’ faults. This is your third fault.”<sup>70</sup> This should be the incident recorded in the *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye za shi*.

[The event in question is probably related to the incident in which] Udāyin and Śāriputra were debating about the concentration in which there is complete extinction of sensation and thought. This was the one and only time Ānanda was reprimanded by the Buddha. According to the *Madhyamāgama*, at the time, Ānanda said to Venerable Śukla that “this was done by another, yet I am reprimanded.”<sup>71</sup> This incident is also found in the *Nirodhasutta* of the *Aṅguttaranikāya*<sup>72</sup> belonging to the Southern tradition, but here there is no mention of resentful speech by Ānanda. The Chinese translation of the *Madhyamāgama* only records that Ānanda said to Venerable Śukla that he was blamed for somebody else’s mistake and was too embarrassed to ask the Buddha about it.

### The Fault of Still Having Some Defilements

The *Jiashe jie jing* states: “The members of this assembly [in the First Council] are utterly free of lust, anger, and ignorance, and only you still possess three defilements ... this is the ninth fault.”<sup>73</sup> This account, found in the *Jiashe jie jing*, is based on the *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye za shi*. After the section detailing Ānanda’s eight faults, the *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye za shi* states that Ānanda had yet to completely end all his defilements. For this reason, Ānanda was not permitted to participate in the assembly of the First Council and was asked to leave.

It seems that the compilers of the *Jiashe jie jing* misunderstood the narra-

---

<sup>69</sup> *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye za shi* [*Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya on Miscellaneous Matters*], T 1451.24.405a20–21: 「世尊在日為說譬喻，汝對佛前別說其事，此是第三過。」

<sup>70</sup> *Jiashe jie jing* [*Sūtra on Kāśyapa Convening the Buddhist Council*], T 2027.49.6a18–19: 「世尊訶汝，汝時恨言：他犯他坐。是為三過。」

<sup>71</sup> *Zhong ahan jing* [*Madhyamāgama*], T 26.1.450b2: 「是他所作，而我得責。」

<sup>72</sup> ZK III 268–272; see also AN III 192–196 (5.166); *Zengzhibu jingdian* [*Aṅguttaranikāya*], N 7.21. 226a13–230a5.

<sup>73</sup> *Jiashe jie jing* [*Sūtra on Kāśyapa Convening the Buddhist Council*], T 2027.49.6a27–29: 「是眾會中無姪怒癡，而汝獨有三垢之瑕……是為九過。」



tive and therefore counted this as another fault. In fact, if having not completely ended all defilements is considered a minor offence, that would mean all disciples who have yet to attain arhatship would be guilty of this fault. Based on the records passed down, it may seem that the vinaya masters from the Northern area singled out Ānanda, and they are suspected of trying to gather as much information as they could to frame him. I believe that this does not align with the actual situation of that time, [having compared other sources].

## 7. Conclusion

The saṃgha led by Mahākāśyapa accused Ānanda of a series of faults. The actual situation and underlying meanings of each fault are clearly detailed in the aforementioned discussion. These faults relate to issues concerning the precepts, women, and failures in his duty as an attendant.

In terms of the faults concerning the precepts, Ānanda's conveyance of the Buddha's final instruction that minor precepts could be discarded represents the position of those who place emphasis on the fundamental spirit of precepts. Those supporting this position believe there is a need for flexibility to cater to changing and different situations. That means that, if after careful consideration, the saṃgha harmoniously and unanimously agrees, then the minor precepts can be discarded. In contrast, Mahākāśyapa represents the position that primary and minor precepts should be upheld equally, and therefore the notion that minor precepts can be discarded is viewed as destroying the vinaya. Those holding this position deplore the notion that minor precepts can be discarded. Accordingly, their conclusion was that whatever precepts the Buddha had set cannot be discarded, while what was not set into rules should not be added. Consequently, this came to mean that only the Buddha could set the precepts and that all those precepts were permanent and fixed.

The opposing positions of practitioners who emphasize the Dharma and those who emphasize the vinaya are described above. The practitioners who emphasize the Dharma are the Dharma preachers who focus on understanding the meaning [of the Dharma] and meditation masters who focus on their practical application (a majority of Ānanda's disciples focused on meditation practices). The practitioners who emphasize the vinaya are the vinaya masters who focus on discipline and, more strictly speaking, they are mainly ascetic

practitioners. The conflict between these two main types of practitioners is clearly reflected in the events surrounding the First and Second Council meetings of the Buddhist saṃgha.

In terms of the issues concerning women, Ānanda pleaded for the allowance of women's ordination, and the Buddha allowed women to be ordained. This reflects a view of gender equality on the path of cultivation and the attainment of liberation. In contrast, what Mahākāśyapa represented was the traditional, patriarchal value system in which women were seen as inferior and a source of trouble. Due to this position, all other aspects were ignored and the bhikṣuṇī saṃgha was unfairly blamed for the shorter duration of the righteous Dharma's presence in the world. As for Ānanda allowing women to first pay respects to the Buddha's relics, this was also considered an act that defiled the Buddha's remains, and so he should have been reprimanded. Ānanda's position in relation to these two aforementioned events concerning women was in full agreement with the Buddha's position.

As for the accusations that Ānanda failed to carry out his duties as an attendant, this was primarily due to the Buddha entering *parinirvāṇa*, which caused the Buddha's disciples to experience grief and sorrow. Inevitably, these grievances were then taken out on Buddha's personal attendant. This is like the situation whereby parents, no matter how old, pass away. The children who are filial will still feel uneasy and blame the parent's death on each other for not extending medical assistance or care, which gives rise to disagreements. Therefore, after the Buddha's *parinirvāṇa*, when the disciples thought about Ānanda not providing water when asked, they felt that he did not perform his duty well and that is why the Buddha was not able to stay longer.

Blaming Ānanda for the Buddha's *parinirvāṇa* certainly is an aspect of human sentiment. However, at that time, Ānanda's faults were made out to be more serious [by the saṃgha led by Mahākāśyapa]. They believed that Ānanda pleaded for women's ordination and so the righteous Dharma would not last as long as expected, and his failure to request the Buddha to remain meant that the Buddha did not stay longer. The early entrance into *parinirvāṇa* and the reduced duration of the righteous Dharma's presence in the world were both viewed as Ānanda's faults. The two events in themselves were ordinary, but afterwards, the causes and effects of these events were analyzed with bias, and Ānanda's so-called faults were regarded as extremely serious. Fortunately, Ānanda had been the Buddha's attendant for 25 years, with a glorious record of

being faultless. In fact, the compilation of the Dharma canon at the First Council could not have happened without Ānanda. Accordingly, those accusations should not undermine Ānanda's merits, just like how the clouds cannot permanently cover the sun and moon. Ānanda will always be regarded as a great being with boundless honor.

## Abbreviation

AN	<i>Aṅguttaranikāya</i> .
ChK	<i>Chōbu kyōten</i> 長部經典. See Takakusu et al., eds., vols. 6–8.
DN	<i>Dīghanikāya</i>
N	<i>Hanyi nanchuan dazangjing</i> . See Gaoxiong Yuanhengsi hanyi nanchuan dazangjing bianyi weiyuanhui, ed., trans.
RZ	<i>Ritsuzō</i> 律藏. See Takakusu et al., eds., vols. 1–5.
SK	<i>Sōōbu kyōten</i> 相應部經典. See Takakusu et al., eds., vols. 12–16b.
SN	<i>Samyuttanikāya</i>
T	<i>Taishō shinshū daijōkyō</i> . See Takakusu and Watanabe, eds.
Vin	<i>Vinaya-piṭaka</i>
ZK	<i>Zōshibu kyōten</i> 增支部經典. See Takakusu et al., eds., vols. 17–22b.

## Bibliography

### Primary Sources

- Apidamo Fazhi lun* 阿毘達磨發智論 [Skt. *Jñānaprasthāna*]. Translated by Xuanzang 玄奘. T 26.
- Bannihuan jing* 般泥洹經 [Skt. *Parinirvāṇasūtra*]. Anonymously translated. T 6.
- Binaiye* 鼻奈耶 [Skt. *Vinaya*]. Allegedly translated by Zhu Fonian 竺佛念. T 1464. “Biqiuni Jiandu” 比丘尼犍度. In *Jiandu* 犍度. Translated by Tongmiao 通妙. N 2.4.342a9–343a2.
- Chang ahan jing* 長阿含經 [Skt. *Dīrghāgama*]. Translated by Fotuoyeshe 佛陀耶舍 and Zhu Fonian 竺佛念. T 1.
- Da banniepan jing* 大般涅槃經 [P. *Mahāparinibbāna Sutta*]. In *Changbu jingdian* 長部經典 [P. *Dīghanikāya*]. Translated by Tongmiao 通妙. N 4.7.

- Da banniepan jing* 大般涅槃經 [Skt. *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*]. Translated by Faxian 法顯. T 7.
- Da zhidu lun* 大智度論 [Skt. *\*Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa*]. Translated by Kumārajīva. T 1509.
- Fo bannihuan jing* 佛般泥洹經 [Skt. *\*Buddhāparinirvāṇasūtra*]. Translated by Bo Fazu 白法祖. T 5.
- Genben sapoduobu lü she* 根本薩婆多部律攝 [Skt. *\*Mūlasarvāstivādinayasamgraha*]. Compiled by Shengyou 勝友, translated by Yijing 義淨. T 1458.
- Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶 [Skt. *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya*]. Translated by Yijing 義淨. T 1442.
- Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye poseng shi* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶破僧事 [Skt. *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya Saṃghabhedavastu*]. Translated by Yijing 義淨. T 1450.
- Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye za shi* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶雜事 [Skt. *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya Kṣudrakavastu*]. Translated by Yijing 義淨. T 1451.
- Jiashe jie jing* 迦葉結經 [Skt. *\*Kāśyapasamgītisūtra*]. Translated by An Shigao 安世高. T 2027.
- Lü ershier mingliao lun* 律二十二明了論 [Skt. *\*Vinayadvāviṃśatiprasannārthasāstra*]. Translated by Zhendi 真諦. T 1461.
- Mishasai bu hexi wufen lü* 彌沙塞部和醯五分律 [Skt. *\*Mahīśāsakavinaya*]. Translated by Fotuoshi 佛馱什 and Zhu Daosheng 竺道生. T 1421.
- Mohe sengqi lü* 摩訶僧祇律 [Skt. *Mahāsāṃghikavinaya*]. Translated by Fotuobatuoluo 佛陀跋陀羅 and Faxian 法顯. T 1425.
- Pinimu jing* 毘尼母經 [Skt. *\*Vinayamāṭṛkā*]. Anonymously translated. T 1463.
- Qutan mi* 瞿曇彌 [P. *Gotamīsuttam*]. In *Zengzhibu jingdian* 增支部經典 [Skt. *Aṅguttaranikāya*]. Translated by Ye Qingchun 葉慶春, Shi Huijing 釋會靖, and Guo Zhezhang 郭哲彰. N 7.23.168a03–174a06.
- Sapoduo pini piposha* 薩婆多毘尼毘婆沙 [Skt. *Sarvāstivādinayavibhāṣā*]. Anonymously translated. T 1440.
- Shisong lü* 十誦律 [Skt. *\*Daśabhāṇavāravīnaya*]. Translated by Foreduoluo 佛若多羅 and Kumārajīva. T 1435.
- Shizhe jing* 侍者經. In *Zhong ahan jing* 中阿含經 [Skt. *Madhyamāgama*]. Translated by Qutan Sengqietipo 瞿曇僧伽提婆. T 26.1.472b22–29.
- Sifen lü* 四分律 [Skt. *\*Dharmaguptakavinaya*]. Translated by Fotuoyeshe 佛陀耶舍 and Zhu Fonian 竺佛念. T 1428.

“Wubai [jieji] jiandu” 五百 [結集] 韃度. In *Jiandu* 韃度. Translated by Tongmiao 通妙. N 2.4.381a02–392a03.

*Youxing jing* 遊行經 [Skt. \**Parivrajyasūtra*]. In *Chang ahan jing* [Skt. *Dirghāgama*]. Translated by Fotuoyeshe 佛陀耶舍 and Zhu Fonian 竺佛念 T 1.1.16b17–23c1.

*Za ahan jing* 雜阿含經 [Skt. *Samyuktāgama*]. Translated by Qiunabatu 求那跋陀. T 99.

*Zhong ahan jing* 中阿含經 [Skt. *Madhyamāgama*]. Translated by Qutan 瞿曇僧伽提婆. T 26.

*Zhuanji sanzang ji zazang zhuan* 撰集三藏及雜藏傳. Anonymously translated. T 2026.

### Modern Sources

Gaoxiong Yuanhengsi hanyi nanchuan dazangjing bianyi weiyuanhui 高雄元亨寺漢譯南傳大藏經編譯委員會, ed. and trans. *Hanyi nanchuan dazangjing* 漢譯南傳大藏經 [Chinese Translation of the Pāli Tipiṭaka]. 70 vols. Kaohsiung: Yuanhengsi Miaolin chubanshe 元亨寺妙林出版社, 1995. Digitized in CBETA in N01–70 (<https://cbetaonline.dila.edu.tw/zh/>).

Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 et al., eds. *Nanden Daizōkyō* 南傳大藏經 [Japanese Translation of the Pāli Tipiṭaka]. 65 vols. Tōkyō: Daizō Shuppan 大藏出版, Shōwa 10–16 [1935–1941].

Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎, and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡邊海旭, eds. *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經 [Buddhist Canon Compiled under the Taishō Era (1912–1926)]. 100 vols. Tōkyō: Taishō issaikyō kankōkai 大正一切經刊行會, 1924–1932. Digitized in CBETA (v. 5.2) (<https://www.cbeta.org>) and SAT Daizōkyō Text Database (<http://21dzk.l.u-Tōkyō.ac.jp/SAT/satdb2015.php>).

Yinshun 印順. “*Guabo wenji xu*” 呬嘑文集序 [Preface to the *Guabo Collected Works*]. In *Miaoyunji* 妙雲集 [Miaoyun Collection], vol. 23, *Huayuxiangyun* 華雨香雲, edited by Yinshun, 241–247. Taipei: Zhengwen chubanshe 正聞出版社, 1973. Originally published ca. 1941, as a preface in the *Guabo Collected Works*, publication information unknown.