

The *Vinayaṭīka* (Buddhist monastic law codes) is comprised of three main aspects: 1) the *Vibhaṅga* (analyses of the rules in the *pāṭimokkhasutta*), 2) the *Khandhaka* (corporate law or transactions of the *saṅgha* and so on), 3) the *Parivāra* (a brief review of the *Vibhaṅga* and *Khandhaka*).

Six *Vinayaṭīkas* have come down to us: the *Pāli Vinaya*, *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya* (*Shifenlü*, 四分律), *Mahīśāsaka-vinaya* (*Wufenlü*, 五分律), *Mahāsāṃghika-vinaya* (*Mohesengqilü*, 摩訶僧祇律), *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya* (*Shisonglü*, 十誦律) and *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* (根本說一切有部律).

In this study, I focus on the *Vibhaṅga* of the four *pārājika* offenses in these *Vinayaṭīkas*. The *Vibhaṅgas* of the four *pārājika* offenses of the *Pāli Vinaya* includes four sections, 1) *nidāna* (episodes that caused the rules to be made, 因緣譚), 2) *sikkhāpada* (the rules, 学处), 3) *padabhājana* (the analyses section of the *sikkhāpada* and offenses, 条文解釈), 4) *vinītaka* (the case-law pertaining to those rules, 判定事例集). And it seems to be similar to the other five extant *Vinayaṭīkas*, but also has many differences in details that have not been emphasized in the previous studies. I want to explore the forming process of these six extant *Vinayaṭīkas* by comparing these differences.

This paper is divided into five sections. Section one is the introduction of the first *pārājika* offence (*methuna*, the rule of celibacy). There are 18 stories in the *nidāna* of this rule of *Mahāsāṃghika-vinaya*, but only 3 stories in the *Pāli Vinaya*. I have compared the stories preserved in the first *pārājika* offence in the six extant *Vinayaṭīkas* and confirmed which one is the older version.

In the second section, I have discussed four problems about the second *pārājika* offence (*adinnādāna*, the theft rule). 1) In the *nidāna* of the *Pāli Vinaya*, in the previous section, the criterion to kill a thief is the one *pāda*, however, in the later section, the criterion was changed into five *māṣakas*. 2) Whether

there is a *mātra* (minister, 大臣) in the *sikkhāpada* of this rule or not. 3) I have discussed if the analyses of *yathārūpeṇādinnādānena* (in such manner of stealing, 隨盜物) is a later insertion of this rule in *Mahāsāṃghika-vinaya*. 4) I also have surveyed the other details which are related to *yathārūpeṇādinnādānena* in the *Vibhaṅgas* of this rule in *Mahāsāṃghika-vinaya*. And I suggest that the *Vibhaṅgas* of this rule in *Mahāsāṃghika-vinaya* might be a new version compared to the other *Vinayaṭītakas*.

Section three discusses the third *pārājika* offence (*manussaviggaha*, the murder rule). In this section, I have surveyed that if suicide is forbidden in the *sikkhāpada* of this murder rule. I also have surveyed the case of a monk who jumps off a cliff which is found in the *Pāli Vinaya*, *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya*, *Mahīśāsaka-vinaya*, *Mahāsāṃghika-vinaya*, *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya*. But the accusation in those *Vinayaṭītakas* is different. In the case of the *Pāli Vinaya*, the monk is charged by a *dukkata* (突吉羅) offence just as jumping from a cliff, but in the other *Vinayaṭītakas*, it is considered by a *thullaccaya* (偷蘭遮) offence as suicide, namely killing himself. That is to say, at least in the *Pāli Vinaya*, a monk jumping from a cliff is not suicide, but in other *Vinayaṭītakas* it is judged as suicide. Furthermore, the judgment in these other *Vinayaṭītakas* is the same as *Samantapāsādikā*, which is a commentary on the *Pāli Vinaya* and postdates the *Pāli Vinaya*. I concluded that the *Pāli Vinaya* is older than the other *Vinayaṭītakas*.

Section four is research on the fourth *pārājika* offence (*uttarimanussadhammapalāpa*, lying about one's spiritual attainments). In this section, I have surveyed the content of *mahācora* (great thieves) in the *nidāna* of this rule in the *Pāli Vinaya*, *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya*, *Mahīśāsaka-vinaya*, *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya* and *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. I found that the content of *mahācora* in fascicle 50 (the part of *Parivāra*) of *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya*, which seems to be the newest part of *Vinayaṭītakas*, is closely paralleled in the *Vibhaṅgas* of the *Pāli Vinaya*, which is considered the older part of *Vinayaṭītakas*.

In section five, I have studied the *vinītaka* of six extant *Vinayaṭītakas*. The *vinītaka* is a part of the *Vibhaṅgas* in the *Pāli Vinaya* found in the part of *Khandhaka* or *Parivāra* in the five Chinese *Vinayaṭītakas*. In this section, I have noticed a characteristic of *vinītaka*: that the episode of *nidāna* reappears

as a brief statement. This characteristic is found in the *vinītaka* of the four *pārājika* offenses in the *Pāli Vinaya*, and the first and fourth *pārājika* offenses in *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya*, and the first *pārājika* offence in *Mahīśāsaka-vinaya* and *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya*, but not found in the *Mahāsāṃghika-vinaya* and *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. I also have researched the interpretations of *ummatta* (狂) and *khittacitta* (散乱心) in the *vinītaka* of *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya* and found that they may have been influenced by the *Abhidharma* texts. The interpretations of *ummatta* and *khittacitta* are found in this *vinītaka* but not in the *vinītakas* of other *Vinayapiṭakas*. However, it is interesting that similar interpretations are also found in the *Abhidharma* texts. It is widely recognized that the *Abhidharma* texts postdate the *Vinayapiṭaka*. So I discussed the relationship between *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya* and *Abhidharma* texts concerning these similar interpretations of *ummatta* and *khittacitta*. In other words, has *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya* influenced the *Abhidharma* texts or conversely? Finally, I have provided evidence that these interpretations of *ummatta* and *khittacitta* in *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya* are from *Abhidharma* texts.