Journal of Chinese Buddhist Studies (2024, 37: 1–43)
New Taipei: Chung-Hwa Institute of Buddhist Studies
中華佛學學報　第三十七期　頁 1–43（民國一百一十三年）新北：中華佛學研究所
ISSN: 2313-2000　e-ISSN: 2313-2019

Buddhist Monasteries and (Their) Oxen:
Daoxuan's Vinaya Commentaries

Ann Heirman
Professor, Department of Languages and Cultures, Ghent University, Belgium

Abstract

Buddhist texts generally prohibit the killing and harming of all sentient beings. This is certainly the case in vinaya (disciplinary) texts, which contain strict guidelines on the preservation of all human and animal life. When these texts were translated into Chinese, they formed the core of Buddhist behavioral codes, influencing both monastic and lay followers. Chinese masters, such as the highly influential Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667), wrote extensive commentaries on and accounts of the vinayas to ease the introduction of Buddhist concepts into the Chinese environment. These texts comprise rich sources of information on material culture in Buddhist monasteries and beyond.

The subject of this paper is oxen and their complex relations with human beings, as discussed in the disciplinary texts. Oxen were commonplace in both India and imperial China, where they were bred and reared for agricultural purposes, and as draft animals. Depending on the context, they could be perceived as annoying, filthy, or useful. They were associated with improper behavior, seen as helpful or even indispensable, or viewed as the innocent victims of human misbehavior.

Yet, all these considerations were overshadowed by the Buddhist proscription against harming or killing any sentient being. Hence, the focus of this paper is Daoxuan's interpretation of this principle in relation to the treatment of oxen, informed by his reading of Indian normative texts and his own Chinese context. As we will see, his guidance was complex, but he always attempted to remain true to what was—and remains—a central tenet of Buddhism.

Keywords:
Buddhist monasticism, vinaya, Daoxuan, animals, oxen

佛教寺院及（其）牛
——道宣的律藏注釋

Ann Heirman
比利時根特大學語言與文化學系教授

摘要

佛教文獻一般禁止殺戮和傷害所有的有情眾生。律藏（vinaya）文本當然也是如此，其中包含了保護所有人類和動物生命的嚴格指導原則。在這些文本被翻譯成漢語後，它們成為了佛教行為準則的核心，同時影響了僧侶和普通信眾。中國的高僧，如極具影響力的道宣（596–667），撰寫了大量關於律藏的註釋和說明，以方便將佛教觀念引入中國的環境。這些文本包含了關於在佛教寺院內外物質文化的豐富信息資料。

本文的主題是在律藏文本中所討論的牛以及牠們與人類的複雜關係。牛在印度和帝制中國都是很常見的。繁殖和飼養牛是出於農業目的。根據不同的語境，牠們可能被認為是討厭的、骯髒的或有用的。人們把牛和行為不當聯繫在一起，又把牠們視為有用和不可或缺的動物，或是當做人類不當行為的無辜受害者。

儘管如此，所有這些看法都比不過佛教禁止傷害或殺戮任何生靈的規定重要。因此，本文的核心在於道宣對這一原則在對待牛相關方面的解釋，而他的解讀是基於他對印度規範性文本和自身中國背景的認識。正如我們將看到的，他的指導原則是複雜的，但他總是試圖忠實於，那些曾經是，並且現在也是佛教的核心宗旨。

關鍵詞：
佛教寺院、律藏、道宣、動物、牛

1. Introduction

Buddhist vinaya (disciplinary) texts devote a striking amount of attention to the animal world, especially humans' relationships with animals, in both metaphorical and material contexts. This paper focuses on one particular animal that has long had a close connection to humans: the ox. It investigates the early Indian vinayas' guidelines on the subject of oxen, then explores how the famous Chinese vinaya master Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667) interpreted these instructions.

The vinaya texts are invaluable sources of information on how early Indian disciplinary masters viewed monastics' dealings with oxen. There are six full, extant vinayas, four of which survive only in Chinese translation; there are Sanskrit, Chinese, and Tibetan versions of the fifth vinaya; and the sixth is extant only in the Pāli language. In chronological order of translation, the five Chinese vinayas are: the *Shisong lü* 十誦律 (T 1435, 23; Sarvāstivāda vinaya); the *Sifen lü* 四分律 (T 1428, 22; Dharmaguptaka vinaya); the *Mohesengqi lü* 摩訶僧祇律 (T 1425, 22; Mahāsāṃghika vinaya); the *Mishasai bu hexi wufen lü* 彌沙塞部和醯五分律 (T 1421, 22; Mahīśāsaka vinaya); and the *Genbenshuoyiqieyou bu pinaiye* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶 (T 1442–1451, 23–24—Yijing's 義淨 (635–713) translation of large parts of the Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya).[1] The first four of these texts were translated in the fifth century CE, whereas Yijing translated the fifth at the beginning of the eighth century. By then, however, a number of influential Buddhist masters had already started to promote the Dharmaguptaka vinaya, which consequently became the principal reference point for monastic discipline throughout China.[2] Arguably the most important of these masters was the monk Daoxuan, who wrote extensive commentaries and accounts in which he meticulously analyzed the vinaya guidelines and introduced them to Chinese audiences. He studied every vinaya translation that was available to him and urged his followers to do the same,[3] although he repeatedly stressed that the Dharmaguptaka vinaya was paramount (T 1804, 40: 2b19–20).

---

1 For further details, see Yuyama, *A Systematic Survey*; Clarke, "Vinayas." As mentioned, a Tibetan translation of the Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya, as well as many Sanskrit sections of the same text, are also extant. For details, see Yuyama, *A Systematic Survey*, 12–33; Clarke, "Vinayas," 73–81.

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

3 The Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya had not yet been translated in Daoxuan's lifetime, so its guidelines will not be discussed in this paper.

In addition to the vinaya texts, Daoxuan gleaned information from other sources to reinforce what he considered the correct interpretation of the Buddhist guidelines. Potential regional differences across the various traditions were ignored, as he regarded all of the protocols as direct instructions from the Buddha himself. The remainder of this paper follows cautiously in Daoxuan's footsteps, first by exploring the vinaya texts' perceptions of oxen, then by investigating how the master incorporated those views into his own work.[4]

2. Oxen in vinaya texts

There are numerous references to oxen in the vinaya texts, with their behavior, the commodities they produce, and how they should be treated all discussed at considerable length.

2.1. Oxen and their improper behavior

Oxen have been a common feature of Indian society for millennia, so it is unsurprising that many people, including monastics, have formulated and articulated quite detailed views on the animals' behavior. In general, such opinions have tended to be far from positive.

a. Annoying and filthy oxen

In vinaya texts, it is not unusual to find a variety of animals—including oxen—associated with irritation, filth, and impurity.[5] One common annoyance is oxen's tendency to enter buildings and compounds, where they may cause a lot of destruction. This prompts the Buddha to allow the construction of doors, walls, or fences to keep out the animals.[6] Even a moat is permitted, with a

---

4 Since this paper focuses on the interpretation of vinaya guidelines in early medieval China, a study of the treatment of oxen in the various religious traditions of ancient India lies beyond the scope of the present research. That said, given the many references to oxen in the vinayas, it is clear that these animals occupied a central position in South Asia, which is automatically represented in Buddhist disciplinary texts. For a brief introduction to other traditions' treatment of animals in ancient India, including oxen and the consumption of beef, see Schmithausen, *Fleischverzehr und Vegetarismus*, 25–31.

5 See, among others, Heirman, "Dangerous and Annoying Animals."

6 See Pāli vinaya, Vin II, p.154; Mahīśāsaka vinaya, T 1421, 22: 167b29–c4; Mahāsāṃghika vinaya, T 1425, 22: 343b15–16; Dharmaguptaka vinaya, T 1428, 22: 941a3–4, 956c21–23; Sarvāstivāda vinaya, T 1435, 23: 243b15–16, 278c1–2.

bridge,[7] and *stūpa*s may be fenced in.[8] In addition, monks are advised to exercise caution when walking among oxen.[9]

Oxen are often represented as filthy as well as annoying and potentially dangerous. For instance, one vinaya text highlights the problem of dust from passing oxen making its way into food,[10] while another points out that dust or dung may soil monks' robes.[11] This is linked to the subject of *pāṃśukulā* (*cīvara*) robes—otherwise known as "refuse rags"—which some members of the monastic community fashioned from cloth retrieved from "dust-heaps" (*pāṃśukulā*s)[12] and wore in accordance with one of the twelve (or thirteen) ascetic practices (*dhūtaguṇa*).[13] These monks and nuns intended to demonstrate their detachment from property and beauty, which they insisted overrode any negative connotations of filth and waste. Nevertheless, they attracted considerable criticism. As Gregory Schopen points out: "To be accepted as a Buddhist monk one must not present in public an unkempt appearance or be seen in disreputable robes."[14] This raises the question of whether monastic robes that have been defiled by oxen may be considered legitimate refuse rags. For instance, two vinaya texts include clothes chewed by

---

The latter vinaya mentions that certain animals, including oxen, may step on jars containing earth used in toilet procedures. Therefore, these jars may be covered with lids (T 1435, 23: 276a26–29). Interestingly, in an echo of its advice on how to respond to an infestation of rats (see Heirman, "What about Rats," 5), the Mahāsāṃghika vinaya permits monastics to drive oxen out of their compounds (presumably, as is stated in the guidance on rats, as long as this is done without anger).

7 Dharmaguptaka vinaya, T 1428, 22: 941c4–6.

8 Dharmaguptaka vinaya, T 1428, 22: 957c13–14; Sarvāstivāda vinaya, T 1435, 23: 351c19–20; 354c19–20.

9 Mahāsāṃghika vinaya, T 1425, 22: 400a20–22; 512a11–12; Sarvāstivāda vinaya, T 1435, 23: 298c19–20; 298c25–26; 420b16–18; 425c17–21; 436c8–12. The last two passages specify that monks should move quietly when walking among oxen.

10 Mahāsāṃghika vinaya, T 1425, 22: 357b29–c1.

11 Mahīśāsaka vinaya, T 1421, 22: 42c27–28.

12 See Witkowski, "Pāṃśukūlika as a Standard Practice in the Vinaya," for a discussion.

13 See Dantinne, *Les qualités de l'ascète*, for a detailed study of Buddhist ascetic practices. See also Muller, *Digital Dictionary*, s.v. *shi'er toutuo* 十二頭陀, http://www.buddhism-dict.net/cgi-bin/xpr-ddb.pl?q=%E5%8D%81%E4%BA%8C%E9%A0%AD%E9%99%80, last accessed May 14, 2023.

14 Schopen, "Cross-dressing with the Dead," 70.

oxen in their lists of permissible refuse rags,[15] whereas the Sarvāstivāda vinaya explicitly categorizes such items as inappropriate refuse rags.[16]

b. Animalistic behavior

When the vinaya texts turn their attention to human impropriety, they often highlight the offender's allegedly impure, animalistic behavior.[17] In this context, they are strongly critical of supposedly ox-like habits and conduct. Much of this criticism relates to poor eating etiquette, as in the Dharmaguptaka vinaya, which contains a long list of unacceptable mealtime manners: starting to eat prior to one's turn (T 1428, 22: 703c21–29); picking out favorite pieces of food and so making holes in what remains (704a20–28); stuffing one's mouth with more food than it can hold (705c23–29);[18] waiting with an open mouth before the food has even arrived (706a18–24); talking with food in one's mouth (706b15–21); rolling food into a ball and then eating half of it (707a1–7); slurping while eating (707b27–c4);[19] compressing large amounts of food (707c20–26); and sticking out one's tongue to lick food (708a12–18).[20] All of

---

15 Mahīśāsaka vinaya, T 1421, 22: 143b13–17; Dharmaguptaka vinaya, T 1428, 22: 850a21–28; 1011b26–28.

16 Sarvāstivāda vinaya, T 1435, 23: 371a7–8; 413c23–25. Similar variance is evident in the vinayas' opinions on rags gnawed by rats (see Heirman, "What about Rats," 3–4).

17 For examples, see, for instance, Heirman and Torck, *A Pure Mind in a Clean Body*, 67–68.

18 This is also mentioned in the Mahāsāṃghika vinaya (T 1425, 22: 404c7–19), which compares it to the behavior of oxen, sheep, and camels, and states that monastics should exercise moderation when eating by taking neither huge nor tiny morsels (which is what prostitutes do).

19 See also the Mahāsāṃghika vinaya (T 1425, 22: 405b3–16), which likens slurping to the behavior of oxen, sheep, camels, and donkeys, and adds that monks who slurp while eating are perceived as "bad and corrupt people" (*huai bai ren* 壞敗人) whose teachings are questionable. The same goes for monks who smack their lips. Such miscreants are also compared to oxen, donkeys, and camels, and criticized for the detrimental impact they may have on the image of the *saṃgha* and its teachings (T 1425, 22: 406a26–b8).

20 The Mahīśāsaka vinaya equally specifies that licking up food with one's tongue is the behavior of an ox and so should be condemned (T 1421, 22: 75b11–16). Licking is also mentioned in the Mahāsāṃghika vinaya (T 1425, 22: 404b22–25), which adds that monks who stick out their tongues while eating are viewed as bad and corrupt people. Similarly, those who chew too much while moving food from one cheek to the other are compared to oxen, camels, and sheep, and risk inciting similar criticism (T 1425, 22: 404b8–21).

these practices are compared to the behavior of oxen, dogs, pigs, donkeys (aside from talking while eating), camels (aside from neglecting to wait for one's turn), and crows. The main message is that lay householders would condemn any monastic who indulges in such inappropriate behavior, which could be highly detrimental to the *saṃgha*, given that monks and nuns should set a "spotless" example for lay society.[21] It is interesting to note that, with the sole exception of crows—birds that were widely reviled for their annoying habit of stealing food—all of the creatures listed by the Dharmaguptaka vinaya are domesticated, which surely testifies to the prevalence of livestock and working animals in medieval Indian society.[22]

The Dharmaguptaka vinaya is also strongly critical of monks who relieve themselves or spit on green grass or in water, with the miscreants once again compared to oxen, pigs, dogs, camels, and donkeys (T 1428, 22: 709a27–b2, 709b21–24).[23] Such behavior is prohibited not only because it is rude and unseemly but also because it is likely to damage the grass or contaminate the pure water (*jing shui* 淨水; T 1428, 22: 709c5).[24] This guideline clearly links routine animal behavior to filth, as is also evident in another passage from the same vinaya that warns monks not to relieve themselves standing up, as oxen, horses, pigs, sheep, and camels do (T 1428, 22: 709c14–17). The Mahāsāṃghika vinaya contains a similar passage in which it compares monks who relieve themselves standing up to oxen, donkeys, and camels; moreover, it defines such behavior as a custom of bad and corrupt people (*huai bai ren* 壞

21 On "spotless" (behavior), see Collins, "The Body in Theravāda Buddhist Monasticism," 194–203.

22 For a discussion of crows, see Heirman, "Dangerous and Annoying Animals," 11.

23 See also the Mahīśāsaka vinaya (T 1421, 22: 76c7–14), which characterizes this as the behavior of oxen and sheep. The Mahāsāṃghika vinaya (T 1425, 22: 411c4–28) equally bans spitting or relieving oneself on fresh grass, but adds that such behavior is permitted where oxen, camels, horses, donkeys, or sheep routinely pass by (seemingly as these places are considered to be unclean anyway). In fact, all of the vinaya traditions prohibit monastics from relieving themselves on green grass, although they do not all compare the practice to animal behavior. Schmithausen, *The Problem of Sentience of Plants*, 31–33, has studied this subject in detail.

24 Buddhist monastics may have stressed their efforts to preserve the purity of water either to signal their respect for some lay followers' belief in water's sentience or to highlight their own adherence to the concept of non-injury (in this case by safeguarding minute, water-borne creatures). For details, see Schmithausen, *The Problem of Sentience of Plants*, 32, 36; and Schmithausen and Maithrimurthi, "Attitudes towards Animals," 45–46, 319–322.

敗人) who bring the *saṃgha* into disrepute (T 1425, 22: 412a19–b1).[25] Finally, the Sarvāstivāda vinaya likens monks who carry goods on their backs to draft oxen and donkeys. As a result, the Buddha bans this practice (T 1435, 23: 275a15–17).

c. Rebirth from among the oxen

One Dharmaguptaka vinaya story relating to animal behavior deserves special attention as it links a monk's poor behavior directly to his earlier life as an ox (T 1428, 22: 954c27–955a2):[26]

> 爾時有比丘在阿蘭若處呵食。餘比丘語言。汝犯非時食彼言。我不犯非時食。我呵耳。諸比丘白佛。佛言。此比丘適從牛中來生此。若其不爾不得久活。若餘比丘有如是病。如是以爲便身無患。唲食出未出口得還咽。
>
> At that time, there was a *bhikṣu* who was chewing his food in a lonely place (araṇya). The other *bhikṣus* told him: "You are offending against the rule of eating at the wrong time (i.e. after noon)." He said: "I am not offending against the rule of eating at the wrong time. I am just chewing." The *bhikṣus* told the Buddha. The Buddha said: "This *bhikṣu* is just now reborn from among the oxen. If he does not do like that, he cannot live long. If other *bhikṣus* have this disease, then it seems that they have a healthy body and no ailments, but they disgorge food, and whether or not it comes out of their mouth, they have to swallow it again."

Although few details are provided, it is clear that rebirth from the animal realm is responsible for the monk's inappropriate behavior, and that he may be excused for this reason. Moreover, as traces of a previous existence may linger after rebirth, the process has the potential to strengthen the links between sentient beings.

---

25 Later, the same text mentions that the first monks relieved themselves in all kinds of places before the Buddha advised them to construct toilets (T 1425, 22: 504a14–17). It also states that monks should avoid the behavior of oxen—that is, relieving themselves while walking or dirtying their feet—even when suffering from diarrhea (T 1425, 22: 505b20–28).

26 There are similar stories in the Mahīśāsaka vinaya (T 1421, 22: 175c7–11) and the Sarvāstivāda vinaya (T 1435, 23: 273c3–11). The latter text adds that monks should chew in a secluded place, not among other people.

2.2. Bovine products

Oxen produce a wide variety of commodities, including beef, leather, milk and other dairy products, and dung, all of which are discussed extensively—and sometimes passionately—in the vinaya texts.

a. Beef and leather

All the vinaya texts address the issue of rearing animals for their meat and/or skin. Although monastics are permitted to eat some types of meat and to use some leather products, the vinayas also impose many restrictions.[27] Moreover, evidently there is a clear link between the consumption of meat or the use of leather and the slaughter of animals. Therefore, whenever meat is offered to members of the monastic community, the *saṃgha* is inevitably associated with killing a sentient being—a practice that Buddhist teaching explicitly condemns. Nevertheless, monastics are permitted to eat a creature's flesh provided they played no part in its death. Hence, it is primarily a question of intent. For instance, if a monk were to visit a village where the laypeople had recently slaughtered an animal, he could accept the offer of its meat and eat it. However, should he even suspect—let alone know for certain—that the animal was killed for his benefit, he would be duty bound not to consume it.[28]

The vinayas demand similar caution with respect to the use of leather. For instance, several of them relate the story of Upananda's visit to a family that herds oxen. In the Dharmaguptaka vinaya version of the tale (T 1428, 22: 846c6–19),[29] the monk notices a calf with a particularly beautiful hide that he is eager to turn into leather for his mat. The owner offers him the hide and promptly kills the calf, but the animal's mother follows Upananda when he leaves the farm with his gift. When his fellow monks ask for an explanation, he tells them what happened, whereupon the Buddha forbids monks to beg for leather. Indeed, the text (T 1428, 22: 846c18–19) clarifies that monks should

---

27 In addition, the Mahāsāṃghika vinaya (T 1425, 22: 391b6–12) and the Sarvāstivāda vinaya (T 1435, 23: 127b7–11) contain strict guidelines on the use of animal bones and horns, including those of oxen.

28 For a recent, detailed study, see Schmithausen, *Fleischverzehr und Vegetarismus*, 19–45.

29 For similar stories, see Mahīśāsaka vinaya, T 1421, 22: 144c8–20; Mahāsāṃghika vinaya, T 1425, 22: 487a29–b23; and Sarvāstivāda vinaya, T 1435, 23: 182b4–24. The Mahāsāṃghika version features another monk, Nanda, as well as Upananda; the calf's owner is characterized as a "bad" (*wu* 惡) person in the Sarvāstivāda version.

not beg for the skin of any *living* creature (*sheng pi* 生皮). In the Mahāsāṃghika vinaya (T 1425, 22: 487b3–13), the owner is initially reluctant to kill the calf and subsequently complains that the monks who requested its slaughter—Upananda and Nanda—are not kind hearted (*wu ci xin* 無慈心). The Buddha's response is to criticize the two monks for ordering the killing of an animal (T 1425, 22: 487b15–16). Similarly, in the Sarvāstivāda vinaya, although the owner has no objection to killing the calf, the Buddha still reprimands Upananda for "consciously killing an animal […] without any kindness in the heart" (*gu duo chusheng ming* […] *wu ci min xin* 故奪畜生命[…]無慈愍心; T 1435, 23: 182b18). In all of these vinayas, the calf's mother displays emotion: she howls in the Dharmaguptaka vinaya (*da hou huan* 大吼喚; T 1428, 22: 846c15–16) and the Sarvāstivāda vinaya (*ming hou* 鳴吼; T 1435, 23: 182b11), laments in the Mahīśāsaka vinaya (*bei ming* 悲鳴; T 1421, 22: 144c14), and calls out while following the fence in the Mahāsāṃghika vinaya (*xun li ming huan* 循籬鳴喚; T 1425, 22: 487b11). These emotions—which are common to both animals and humans—again strengthen the relationship between all sentient beings.

Nevertheless, the Buddha does not impose a total ban on the use of leather: some is allowed, particularly for monastic footwear.[30] In addition, the Mahīśāsaka vinaya states that sheep, cow, or deer leather may be used to make bags for provisions (T 1421, 22: 144c20–21). The text even provides care instructions, suggesting that the bags should not be washed too often in order to prevent rot (T 1421, 22: 146c29–147a5). The Mahāsāṃghika vinaya permits the use of leather below the knee and allows monks to sit on benches with leather slats (T 1425, 22: 487b22–23). The Dharmaguptaka vinaya advises wrapping knives in leather sheaths, and does not prohibit monks from sailing in boats with leather components (T 1428, 22: 846c23–27).[31] By contrast, the Sarvāstivāda vinaya explicitly bans monks from sitting or sleeping on leather (T 1435, 23: 182b24), while the Mahīśāsaka vinaya relates a cautionary tale in which a group of monks who ignored this proscription were killed by evil beasts that were attracted by the scent of the leather (T 1421, 22: 147a5–7).[32]

---

30 For details, see Heirman, "Shoes in Buddhist Monasteries."

31 However, the Dharmaguptaka vinaya does ban the use of cow and some other types of leather (T 1428, 22: 1006a17).

32 The same vinaya allows monks to accept a vehicle that contains some leather as a gift. However, the leather should be removed and replaced with cloth (T 1421, 22: 144c28–145a2). On the other hand, sheep or cow leather may be fashioned into a floating bag (*fu nang* 浮囊) to aid in the crossing of rivers (T 1421, 22: 145a11–12).

b. Cow's milk and other dairy products

Milk and products derived from milk are commonly included in lists of monastic medicines. For instance, a *niḥsargika pācittika* rule[33] that features in every vinaya permits a sick monk to take several remedies for up to seven days. The Dharmaguptaka vinaya (T 1428, 22: 628a15–16) mentions five such medicines: *su* 酥 (ghee), *you* 油 (oil), *sheng su* 生酥 (fresh butter), *mi* 蜜 (honey), and *shi mi* 石蜜 (syrup).[34] A parallel rule in the Pāli vinaya reveals that these presumably equate to the Sanskrit terms *sarpis*, *taila*, *navanīta*, *madhu*, and *phāṇita*, respectively.[35] This paper will focus on the two dairy products: *su* (*sarpis*) and *sheng su* (*navanīta*). In addition, in the Mahāsāṃghika vinaya (T 1425, 22: 362c17–19), a doctor prescribes milk itself as a medicine for a monk who has fallen ill, whereupon the latter is allowed to beg for it at a farmer's house.[36]

The vinayas contain further instructions on the consumption of milk outside the medicinal context, and especially whether it should be accepted as a gift. For instance, the Mahīśāsaka vinaya (T 1421, 22: 151b13–15) tells the story of

---

33 *Niḥsargika pācittika* (or variants) rules relate to objects that are unlawfully obtained and therefore must be surrendered. See Heirman, *The Discipline in Four Parts*, 138–141.

34 See also Pāli vinaya, Vin III, p.251; Mahīśāsaka vinaya, T 1421, 22: 31c11–13 (which does not mention fresh butter); Mahāsāṃghika vinaya, T 1425, 22: 316c14–18 (which adds fat (*zhi* 脂)); Sarvāstivāda vinaya, T 1435, 23: 61a13–16 (which does not mention fresh butter); and Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya, T 1442, 23: 759b20–23 (which mentions ghee, oil, sugar (*tang* 糖), and honey). The Mahāsāṃghika vinaya (T 1425, 22: 244c14–15, 244c23) explains that ghee can be made from the milk of cows, buffalo, sheep, or camels. See also Kotyk, "Milk, Yogurt and Butter," 4.

35 For the Pāli equivalents, see Vin III, p.251. Monier Monier-Williams (*A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, 718) defines *phāṇita* as "the inspissated juice of the sugar cane and other plants." The equivalent Chinese term *shi mi* 石蜜 refers to both syrup and crystallized sugar (cf. Kieschnick, *The Impact of Buddhism*, 252). It was sometimes added to dairy products, possibly as a means of preservation. For details, see Sabban, "Un savoir-faire oublié: le travail du lait en Chine ancienne," 51–52. It is also probable that some technical knowledge of sugarcane, and *shi mi*, entered China via Buddhist material culture transmission (although sugarcane was known in China in the pre-Buddhist era), as some Indian monasteries cultivated sugar. See Kieschnick, *The Impact of Buddhism*, 249–262.

36 However, nuns who are fit and well are instructed not to beg for medicine, including milk and other dairy products. See Mahāsāṃghika vinaya, T 1425, 22: 544a17–25.

a group of monks who are reluctant to accept such an offer from a donor on the grounds that the Buddha has not explicitly permitted them to drink warm milk from a cow (*re niu ru* 熱牛乳). In response, the Buddha stipulates that this is permissible. Meanwhile, the Mahāsāṃghika vinaya (T 1425, 22: 386a12–16) specifies that monks may accept a farmer's offer of more milk from other cows if the milk of just one is insufficient. Another issue is raised in the Dharmaguptaka vinaya, which contains a passage in which a calf drinks from its mother's udder before the farmer milks the adult cow and offers the bowl to a group of monks. However, they decline the gift when they see the calf spitting out some saliva that looks like milk. The reason for their reluctance is rather unclear, but it seems to be linked to disgust over the prospect of consuming an animal's saliva rather than any concern for the calf's welfare. Either way, the Buddha reassures them that they could have accepted the proffered milk (T 1428, 22: 869b18–21, 973a14–18).[37]

The Dharmaguptaka vinaya (T 1428, 22: 854c18–20) also provides some information on the production of a series of dairy products: fermented, creamy milk (*lao* 酪) was made from cow's milk (*ru* 乳); ghee (*su* 酥) was made from fermented milk; heated ghee (*re su* 熟酥) was made from ghee; and *tihu* (醍醐) was made from heated ghee. Given that there are no Indic equivalents for some of these terms, it is hard to know the precise nature of these substances. However, as mentioned earlier, a pair of parallel passages from the Dharmaguptaka vinaya and the Pāli vinaya confirms that *sarpis* (ghee) was in all probability translated as *su*, so that could very well be the case here, too. And we know that the basic ingredient of ghee was *lao* 酪, which the *Shuowen jiezi* 說文解字 (*Discussing Writing and Explaining Characters*; compiled by Xu Shen 許慎 in 100 CE) defines as "thick fluid from milk" (乳漿也),[38] suggesting a type of (probably fermented) cream.[39] The ghee itself was then heated to obtain *re su*, which in turn was further refined into *tihu*. The *Shuowen jiezi* defines the latter as "the fine [product] of fermented creamy milk" (酪之

37 The second of the two cited passages explicitly extends this guideline to five dairy products: milk (*ru* 乳), fermented creamy milk (*lao* 酪), fresh butter (*sheng su* 生酥), heated ghee (*re su* 熟酥), and *tihu* (醍醐).

38 https://ctext.org/dictionary.pl?if=en&id=36521, last accessed May 14, 2023.

39 See Sabban, "Un savoir-faire oublié: le travail du lait en Chine ancienne," 40. *Lao* 酪 may be the Chinese equivalent of the Sanskrit term *dadhi* (a type of thick, sour milk). See Kotyk, "Milk, Yogurt and Butter," 2. On the history of fermented milk in India (which may be traced to between 6000 and 4000 BCE), see Bintsis and Papademas, "The Evolution of Fermented Milks," 2 and 6. *Dahi/dadhi* results from the spontaneous fermentation of either cows' milk or buffalo milk.

精者也).[40] Similarly, in his study of dairy products in medieval China and Japan, Jeffrey Kotyk describes *tihu* as "refined ghee, which in Indian thought was often considered to be the foremost flavor."[41] The Dharmaguptaka vinaya also characterizes this substance as especially "fine" (*jing* 精), when stating that "the finest one is the most important" (*zui jing di yi* 最精第一). All of this seems to corroborate the theory that these substances were produced in a sequence of increasing refinement.[42]

Clearly, then, milk was widely known in monastic life, with dairy products commonly perceived as acceptable medicines. While the story in the Dharmaguptaka vinaya reveals a degree of wariness toward cows' secretions, such as saliva, there is no suggestion that drinking cows' milk might be harmful to either the adult cow or the calf, or that separating the two might be problematic. By contrast, as we shall see below, Daoxuan displays far more concern with the animals' welfare.

c. Cow dung

Laypeople and monastics both used cow dung for a variety of purposes in their everyday lives, so it is no surprise that it features prominently in many vinaya passages. For instance, while monks and nuns were acutely aware of the need to keep themselves—and particularly their robes—clean at all times,[43] there are several uncritical references to them collecting dung.[44]

---

40 https://ctext.org/dictionary.pl?if=en&id=36522, last accessed May 14, 2023.

41 See Kotyk, "Milk, Yogurt and Butter," 2. For other interpretations, see Kotyk, "Milk, Yogurt and Butter," 2–3.

42 This is also how Françoise Sabban interprets the list of dairy products in "Un savoir-faire oublié: le travail du lait en Chine ancienne," 40–42.

43 On cow dung soiling robes, see Mahīśāsaka vinaya, T 1421, 22: 180c3–10; and Mahāsāṃghika vinaya, T 1425, 22: 303c16. Places with cow dung were also considered to be unclean (Mahāsāṃghika vinaya, T 1425, 22: 543b8–9). See also note 22, above.

44 See, for instance, Mahīśāsaka vinaya, T 1421, 22: 80a18–20. According to the Mahāsāṃghika vinaya (T 1425, 22: 340a24–25), it is important not to damage fresh grass when collecting dung. (For more details on fresh grass, see note 22, above.) Although the act of collecting dung is not criticized, the Dharmaguptaka vinaya (T 1428, 22: 956b20–24) states that monastics should carry firewood or dung on their backs or shoulder poles only in places where they will not be seen, presumably to avoid comparisons with laboring laypeople and, indeed, draft animals.

(Dried) cow dung was used to cleanse the hands following urination or defecation,[45] with the Mahīśāsaka vinaya (T 1421, 22: 177b25) stating that the dung should be stored in a vessel for this purpose. Meanwhile, the Dharmaguptaka vinaya asserts that begging bowls (T 1428, 22: 801c19–20) and clothing (T 1428, 22: 936a3–4) can both be cleaned with dung. Later, the same vinaya (T 1428, 22: 953a19–25) specifies that sand should be filtered out of the dung prior to cleaning to ensure that the begging bowl is not scratched. However, it prohibits the use of a clump of grass and dung as a cleaning agent after either defecation or urination (T 1428, 22: 932b3–6).[46] This suggests that the monastic community had a rather ambivalent relationship with cow dung, using it only when it had been carefully prepared and only for specific purposes.

Cow dung was also used alongside grass and wood when making fires.[47] However, given that monastics have to be mindful not to harm any sentient being (such as small insects that might reside in firewood or dung), two vinayas (Mahīśāsaka vinaya, T 1421, 22: 5b1–21; Dharmaguptaka vinaya, T 1428, 22: 572b6–c4) prohibit the building of mud huts (*ni shi* 泥室, "mud hut"; *wa wu* 瓦屋, "tile hut") made of fired tiles.[48] On the other hand, cow dung may be used to repair a damaged building (Dharmaguptaka vinaya, T 1428, 22: 641b21–22), or in the construction of a *stūpa* (Dharmaguptaka vinaya, T 1428, 22: 956c6–8; c18–19).

---

45 See Mahīśāsaka vinaya, T 1421, 22: 177b21–25; and Dharmaguptaka vinaya, T 1428, 22: 801c7; 932b19–21. Alkaline soil (*lu tu* 鹵土), ashes (*hui* 灰), and mud (*ni* 泥) were used for the same purpose. For details, see Heirman and Torck, *A Pure Mind in a Clean Body*, 71.

46 In a similar context, the Sarvāstivāda vinaya (T 1435, 23: 54c18–20; 419b6–10) asserts that begging bowls should not be taken into the toilet or the bathing room and advises against washing them with cow dung mixed with sand (although no reason is given for the latter injunction).

47 See Mahāsāṃghika vinaya, T 1425, 22: 365a7–9; Dharmaguptaka vinaya, T 1428, 22: 572b6–c4, 954b1–9; and Sarvāstivāda vinaya, T 1435, 23: 104c14–17..

48 As the Dharmaguptaka vinaya (T 1428, 22: 572b24–25) puts it: "I [the Buddha] have always, in innumerable ways, said to be kind to sentient beings." 我常無數方便説慈愍衆生. The Mahīśāsaka vinaya does not mention the use of cow dung in this context, referring only to firewood.

2.3. Keeping and using oxen

In addition to the aforementioned rules relating to products derived from oxen, the vinaya texts address monastics' dealings with the animals themselves, not least because of recurring concerns about how they should be treated.

a. Using oxen for plowing

A short passage in the Mahīśāsaka vinaya (T 1421, 22: 190a20–23) contains one of the vinaya texts' few references to plowing with oxen in a monastic context. Despite the rarity of such accounts, there is no suggestion that the practice should be avoided, although monks and nuns are discouraged from overseeing it themselves, lest they should attract criticism from the lay community for laboring in the fields. Instead, the work should be supervised by a lay attendant (*jing ren* 淨人).[49]

b. Crossing a river and using a vehicle

In contrast to the limited advice on plowing, the vinaya texts regularly discuss how best to cross a river. For instance, when no boat is available, monastics are encouraged to ford a river in the company of oxen, holding the animals' tails to ensure a safe passage. However, monks are instructed to hold only male oxen's tails, whereas nuns must grasp only female oxen's tails.[50] Similarly, aged or infirm monastics may travel in vehicles pulled by oxen. Once again, though, monks should not use a vehicle pulled by a female animal, and nuns should avoid male animals.[51]

---

49 A *jing ren* (*kalpikāraka*) is a layperson who, among other duties, makes situations "pure"—that is, acceptable or permissible—for a monastic, such as by accepting donations on the monastic's behalf or by executing certain tasks. For further details, see Kieffer-Pülz, "Stretching the *Vinaya* Rules," 20–21.

50 See Dharmaguptaka vinaya, T 1428, 22: 846c20–22; 986c22–24; Sarvāstivāda vinaya, T 1435, 23: 182c5–8; 405a28–b2; Mahīśāsaka vinaya, T 1421, 22: 145a5–9. The latter vinaya also refers to the use of floating bags; see note 31, above. The Mahāsāṃghika vinaya (T 1425, 22: 304a14–16) refers to walking with oxen but cautions that the animals should be small and specifies that monks should not walk with female oxen.

51 Pāli vinaya, Vin I, pp.191–192; Mahīśāsaka vinaya, T 1421, 22: 144c23–28; Mahāsāṃghika vinaya, T 1425, 22: 456a28–29; 537c29–538a2; Dharmaguptaka vinaya, T 1428, 22: 848c1–3; Sarvāstivāda vinaya, T 1435, 23: 182b25–c1.

c. Releasing oxen

The vinaya texts also regularly address the release of animals, including oxen.[52] For instance, after mentioning an impressive donation, including a herd of oxen, to a monastery (T 1425, 22: 495a12–16), the Mahāsāṃghika vinaya provides detailed guidelines on how monastics should deal with gifts of animals and servants (T 1425, 22: 495b17–c8). In the introductory story, a rich householder offers the monastery 500 elephants and 500 slaves and maid-servants (*nübi* 奴婢), but the monks are unsure whether they should accept his donation. The Buddha advises that no living being should be accepted and provides several examples: elephants, horses, oxen, water buffalo, donkeys, sheep, roebucks, deer, pigs, parrots, peacocks, chickens, slaves, and maid-servants. The sole exception to this rule is that monks are permitted to accept a male attendant (*jing ren* 淨人)—and nuns a female attendant—to assist in administering the monastery's affairs. If the owner of proffered animals insists that he will have to slaughter them if they are not accepted, the monks must instruct him to release them, offer them water and food, and ensure that they remain unharmed. Similarly, the wings of birds should not be clipped and they must not be kept in cages. If they can fly, walk, and live independently (*zi huo* 自活), they should be released. In principle, then, oxen—like all other animals—should not be accepted as gifts. Nevertheless, as we have seen, monastics did use these animals to pull their carts and plow their fields, albeit under the supervision of lay attendants.

At times, monastics are also tempted to release animals in acts of kindness, even when the animals have owners. For instance, the Dharmaguptaka vinaya (T 1428, 22: 974a13–20) tells the story of a monk who releases a dog. While taking someone else's property is generally classified as stealing—a *pārājika* offense (the most serious category of monastic offense, punishable by loss of monastic status)—the Buddha declares that the monk did not actually commit such a serious offence, due to his good intentions. However, he adds that he should have left the dog where it was, with its rightful owner. Similarly, in another Dharmaguptaka story (T 1428, 22: 978b2–11), although the owner of an ox is described as a bandit (*zei* 賊), the vinaya explains that depriving him of his animal would normally be considered a *pārājika* offense. However, after a monk releases (*jie fang qu* 解放去) the ox out of kindness (*ci xin* 慈心), the Buddha deems this a less serious transgression (although, once again, he

52 For a discussion of the vinaya texts' guidelines on the release of animals, see, among others, Heirman, "Dangerous and Annoying Animals," 7–9.

reprimands the monk for behaving as he did). The Sarvāstivāda vinaya (T 1435, 23: 6c7–15) also warns against removing animals from their rightful owners: if a monk releases an elephant, horse, ox, sheep, donkey, or mule tied with a cord, with the intention to steal, he commits a *pārājika* offense. This is also the case when such an animal is kept inside walls or fences, or in a place where it sleeps. By contrast, if the animal is walking unguarded, taking it away is judged to be a *sthūlātyaya* offense (slightly less serious than a *pārājika* offense, albeit still grave). In addition, a monk commits a *pācittika* offense (a lesser transgression that may be expiated) if he kills an animal he has stolen.[53] However, if he then takes the meat, and the meat is worth more than five coins (*qian* 錢; *māṣaka*), he again commits a *pārājika* offense.[54] While there is no mention of any mitigating circumstances (such as a monk acting out of kindness) in this lengthy discussion of various breaches of monastic discipline and their associated punishments, the Sarvāstivāda vinaya asserts in another passage that if a monk releases (*fang ling qu* 放令去; *jie fang ling qu* 解放令去) animals, such as oxen, with a "happy heart" (*kuai xin* 快心), he commits a *sthūlātyaya*, rather than a *pārājika*, offense (T 1435, 23: 381a20–24). Similarly, in yet another passage, the vinaya decrees that a monk commits no more than a minor *duṣkṛta* offense if, in an act of kindness (*lian min* 憐愍), he releases an ox that a bandit has tethered to a tree (T 1435, 23: 430c17–21). Thus, it seems that intent must be taken into consideration when determining the seriousness of an offence. Certainly, that is Daoxuan's interpretation of these guidelines, as we shall see below.

3. Oxen in Daoxuan's vinaya commentarie

Oxen and their associated products were commonplace on the Indian subcontinent, where the vinayas were written. Hence, it is no surprise that these

---

53 All vinayas categorize deliberately killing an animal a *pācittika* offense: Pāli vinaya, Vin IV, pp.124–125; Mahīśāsaka vinaya, T 1421, 22: 58a15–b9; Mahāsāṃghika vinaya, T 1425, 22: 377a26–378a26; Dharmaguptaka vinaya, T 1428, 22: 677a24–25; Sarvāstivāda vinaya, T 1435, 23: 110b28–111a26; Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya, T 1442, 23: 847c18–848a16.

54 Five coins is generally regarded as the threshold over which an offense of stealing becomes a *pārājika* (see T 1435, 23: 4c1). The value of a *māṣaka* is hotly disputed, but it was not particularly high. See, for instance, Rhys Davids and Stede, *The Pali Text Society's Pali–English Dictionary*, 531, s.v. *masaka*: "lit. a small bean, used as a standard of weight & value; hence a small coin of very low value. Of copper, wood & lac."

disciplinary texts contain numerous references to the animals' behavior, guidelines on how they and their products should be used, and advice on how they should be treated. By contrast, the residents of seventh-century China generally encountered oxen almost exclusively as beasts of burden that were used to plow farmers' fields and pull carts, or as commodity-producing farm animals.[55] Consequently, Daoxuan, informed by his strict adherence to the principle of non-killing and non-harming, and by a determination to maintain the reputation of the *saṃgha*, focuses on the exploitation of such animals.

This section focuses on Daoxuan's most renowned commentary—the *Sifen lü shanfan buque xingshi chao* 四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔 (*An Abridged and Explanatory Commentary on the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*; T 1804, 40)—as well as his *Liang chu qing zhong yi* 量處輕重儀 (*Models for Measuring and Handling Light and Heavy Property*; T 1895, 45), a treatise in which he offers advice on how to deal with gifts—including animals—that are offered to the monastic community. In these two texts, Daoxuan articulates a number of strong opinions on the presence and use of oxen in Chinese Buddhist monasteries.

As mentioned, in imperial China, oxen were primarily bred and reared for agricultural purposes and as draft animals, so Daoxuan probably had at least some of these functions in mind when reflecting on their presence in the monastic environment. While no monk should ever intentionally injure or kill any animal, including an ox, monastics were still permitted to utilize such creatures, provided they suffered no harm. It was in this context that Daoxuan turned his attention to oxen offered as gifts, the proper treatment of such animals, the consumption of beef and cows' milk, and the use of cow dung.[56]

3.1. Keeping and rearing oxen

In one of *Sifen lü shanfan buque xingshi chao*'s most powerful passages, Daoxuan builds a strong case that all animals should be treated with consideration. As we will see below, he argues that this is an indispensable component of good morality, and an essential aspect of monastic life. He bases his argument on three texts. First, he cites the **Saṃyuktābhidharmahṛdayaśāstra*

55 On animal husbandry in early medieval northern China, see, among others, Knapp, "The Use and Understanding of Domestic Animals." The most important function of cattle was as draft animals, although beef and dairy products were consumed.

56 In contrast to the vinayas, Daoxuan does not mention leather in any of his discussions of oxen.

(T 1552, 28: 890b12–c3)[57] and its discourse on "restraint and non-restraint" (*lü yi bu lü yi* 律儀不律儀; i.e. good and evil deportment), which explains that good morality is a prerequisite for monastic ordination and should be displayed toward all living beings.[58] Next, he references the *Upāsakaśīla Sūtra* (T 1488, 24: 1069c8–1070a2), which states that those who follow good precepts (*shan jie* 善戒) receive many blessings, whereas those who follow incorrect precepts (*e jie* 惡戒) amass immeasurable faults.[59] Finally, he refers to a philosophical treatise, the **Tattvasiddhiśāstra* (T 1646, 32).[60] Although he does not provide a precise citation, we may assume that he is thinking of a passage that contrasts the benefits of good deportment (*shan lü yi* 善律儀) with the unwelcome repercussions of bad deportment (*bu shan lü yi* 不善律儀) (T 1646, 32: 302b21–303c3).

In full, the passage from the *Sifen lü shanfan buque xingshi chao* (T 1804, 40: 23c8–15) reads as follows:

> 滅法不久。寺家庫藏廚所多不結淨。道俗通濫淨穢混然。立寺經久。綱維無教。忽聞立淨惑耳驚心。豈非師僧上座妄居淨住導引後生同開惡道。或畜貓狗專擬殺鼠。牛杖馬鞅韁絆箠檛。如是等類並是惡律儀。雜心云。惡律儀者流注相續成也。善生成論。若受惡律儀則失善戒。今寺畜貓狗。並欲盡形。非惡律儀何也。舉衆同畜一衆無戒。
>
> [If the aforementioned behavior continues], the disappearance of the Dharma is not far away. The storage rooms and kitchens of monasteries have often not been designated as purified [places] (*jie jing* 結淨).[61]

---

57 This Sarvāstivāda *abhidharma* text was written by Dharmatrāta at the beginning of the fourth century CE and translated into Chinese by the monk Saṃghavarman in 434. See Dessein, *Saṃyuktābhidharmahṛdaya*, for an introduction and full translation. The passage in question is in Vol.1 at 167–169.

58 For a more detailed discussion of this and the subsequent references, see also Heirman, "What about Rats," 10–11.

59 *Sūtra on Upāsaka Precepts*, translated by the monk Dharmarakṣa between 424 and 426. See Shih Heng-ching, *The Sutra on Upāsaka Precepts*, for an introduction and full translation. The passage in question is at 176–177.

60 The **Tattvasiddhiśāstra* is a philosophical treatise compiled by the Indian monk Harivarman in the middle of the third century CE and translated into Chinese by the monk Kumārajīva at the beginning of the fifth century. See Demiéville et al., *Répertoire du canon bouddhique*, 139; Potter, *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*, 255 and 741, note 317.

61 The term jie jing signifies that a particular location has been officially designated (*jie* 結) as a "purified place" (*jing di* 淨地). In this case, a monastery's storage

> Monastics and laity intermingle [throughout the monasteries], and what is pure or dirty becomes indistinguishable. Monasteries have been established for a long time, but regulations have not been taught. When [monastics] suddenly heard of [the correct procedure for] establishing a purified [storage room and kitchen], they were confused and shocked. Is it not that teachers and seniors, completely oblivious of a pure life, lead the younger generation on a journey down an unwholesome path? Some keep cats and dogs with the specific intention of killing rats, or they [have] sticks for oxen, reins for horses, halters, and pegs. All such acts are evil deportment (*e lü yi* 惡律儀).[62] The *Za xin* 雜心 (**Saṃyuktābhidharmahṛdayaśāstra*) says that "evil deportment" (*e lü yi*) means that there is a continuous flow [of unwholesome acts].[63] The *Shansheng* 善生 (*Upāsakaśīla Sūtra*)[64] and the *Cheng lun* 成論 (**Tattvasiddhiśāstra*)[65] [leave no doubt that] if one embraces evil deportment, one loses good morality. Now, [monastics] keep cats and dogs in their monasteries, with the intention of having them for their whole lives. If this is not evil deportment, what else can it be? [If] the whole community together keeps [cats and dogs], [then] the whole community is lacking [vinaya] rules.

Although this passage focuses on cats and dogs, it also refers to what Daoxuan perceives as his fellow monastics' mistreatment of oxen and horses.[66] Yet,

---

room and kitchen should be *jie jing* before food is stored or prepared within them (potentially by laypeople as well as monks). In this way, behavior that is not ordinarily permitted in a monastery may be "purified"—that is, made acceptable. For vinaya references, see Heirman, "What about Rats," 10.

62 The term *e lü yi* (asaṃvara) refers to immoral practices that go against vinaya. See Muller, *Digital Dictionary*, s.v. *e lü yi* 惡律儀, http://www.buddhism-dict.net/cgi-bin/xpr-ddb.pl?q=%E6%83%A1%E5%BE%8B%E5%84%80, last accessed May 14, 2023.

63 *Za xin* is a reference to the *Za apitan xin lun* 雜阿毘曇心論 (**Saṃyuktābhidharmahṛdayaśāstra*; T 1552, 28).

64 *Shansheng* is a reference to the *Youposai jie jing* 優婆塞戒經 (*Upāsakaśīla Sūtra*; T 1488, 24), also known as the *Shansheng jing* 善生經 (*Sujata Sūtra*), as Sujata is the main character. Cf. Shih Heng-ching, *The Sutra on Upāsaka Precepts*, 1.

65 Daoxuan uses the abbreviation "*Cheng lun*" in reference to the *Chengshi lun* 成實論 (**Tattvasiddhiśāstra*; T 1646, 32).

66 For detailed studies on cats in medieval Chinese monasteries, see, in particular, Barrett, *The Religious Affiliations of the Chinese Cat* and "The Monastery Cat";

while he insists that cats and dogs should be banned from all monasteries (as they are kept "with the specific intention of killing rats"), he does not advocate such a drastic measure regarding oxen, as we shall see below.

3.2. The treatment of oxen

Daoxuan devotes considerable attention to the question of whether monasteries should accept animals as gifts. In a long section of the *Sifen lü shanfan buque xingshi chao*, he insists that monks should neither keep nor raise any animals, including oxen, from which he extrapolates that they should also not accept them as donations (T 1804, 40: 70b5–14). He first refers to the Sarvāstivāda vinaya, which contains a list of ten types of donations that monasteries should reject (T 1435, 23: 363b22–26), including weapons, alcohol, and "fierce oxen." Daoxuan adds the so-called "five domesticated animals" (*wu chu* 五畜) to this list, as he feels they are equally unacceptable.[67] Hence, his revised list includes all types of oxen. Next, he turns to the previously discussed Mahāsāṃghika vinaya passage on the correct procedure for dealing with gifts of animals, slaves, and servants (T 1804, 40: 70b9–14; T 1425, 22: 495b17–c8), in which the Buddha advises monasteries to decline the offer of any living being, including oxen.[68] The guideline ends with the ominous injunction "do not restrain them [i.e. animals]" (*mo ju zhi* 莫拘之; T 1804, 40: 70b14; T 1425, 22: 495c7).

Daoxuan then refines his position with reference to three more sources (T 1804, 40: 70b14–18): the *Shanjian lü piposha* 善見律毘婆沙, which states that no animals (including oxen) should be accepted as gifts, although it does not take issue with dairy products such as milk (*ru* 乳) and fermented creamy milk (*lao* 酪) (T 1462, 24: 776c13–15);[69] the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, which

---

Barrett and Strange, "Walking by Itself." For a similar study on dogs, see Heirman, "Buddhist Monastics and (Their) Dogs."

67 That is, oxen, sheep, pigs, chickens, and dogs. Cf. Wu, Huang, and Liu, *Ciyuan* 辭源, 135, s.v. 五畜.

68 Daoxuan refers to the same passage in his *Liang chu qing zhong yi* (T 1895, 45: 845c4–5). For a discussion, see Heirman, "How to Treat Animals."

69 The *Shanjian lü piposha* is sometimes represented as a direct translation of the Pāli *Samantapāsādikā*, a commentary on the Pāli vinaya that is traditionally attributed to the monk Buddhaghosa. See von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*, 103–104, for further information on this attribution and why it may be problematic. The Chinese translation, which was completed in 488–489, is attributed to the monk Saṃghabhadra (?–?), but its relationship to the Pāli text is far from straightforward and has been widely debated. See, for instance, Pinte, "Lost in

prohibits monks from trading in animals (T 375, 12: 716b19–20); and the *Qielun* 伽論, an abbreviation Daoxuan uses for the *Sapoduo bu pini modeleqie* 薩婆多部毘尼摩得勒伽 (*Sarvāstivāda* [**nikāya* (?)] *Vinaya*mātṛkā*; T 1441, 23), a Chinese translation of a vinaya commentary attributed to Saṃghavarman (fl. early fifth century).[70] According to Daoxuan (T 1804, 40: 70b16–17), the latter text permits monastics to accept gifts of camels, horses, and donkeys when these are offered for the good of a *stūpa*. Although he does not provide a precise citation, this is probably a reference to a passage that allows monasteries to accept gifts of elephants, horses, camels, oxen, and buffalo as long as these benefit a *stūpa* or the *saṃgha* in some way (T 1441, 23: 597a13–14).[71] Finally, Daoxuan points out that some donors offer animals in support of the Buddha and the Dharma. In such circumstances, the monastic manager (*zhishi* 知事) should not sell the animals, as this would contravene the noble teachings.[72] Hence, the implication is that *zhishi*s are permitted to take possession of such donations. Of course, this represents a significant shift from Daoxuan's original position, when he seemed to argue that the offer of any living creature should be refused.

There is another mention of oxen in an earlier section of the same commentary (T 1804, 40: 57c18–20). Citing a text entitled *Wu bai wen* 五百問 (*Five Hundred Questions*), Daoxuan states:

> 五百問云。[…] 若有施佛牛奴。不得受用及賣易之。若施軍器亦不得受。
>
> The *Five Hundred Questions* says: "[…] If someone offers oxen and servants to the Buddha, they should not be accepted, used, and [then?] sold. If someone offers weapons, they equally cannot be accepted."

One possible source of this rather ambiguous quote is the *Fo shuo Mulian wen jielü wu bai qing zhong shi* 佛說目連問戒律中五百輕重事 (*Five Hundred*

Translation," for further details on the Chinese text and its relationship to the Pāli *Samantapāsādikā*.

70 See Demiéville et al., *Répertoire du canon bouddhique*, 123; and Clarke, "Vinayas," 80–81, who argues that the *Sapoduo bu pini modeleqie* is closely affiliated with the Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya.

71 However, this assumption is problematic given that Daoxuan omits elephants, oxen, and buffalo from his list, includes donkeys in their place, and says nothing of the *saṃgha*.

72 A *zhishi* 知事 (*karmadāna*) is a monastery's director of affairs. See Muller, *Digital Dictionary*, s.v. *zhishi* 知事, http://www.buddhism-dict.net/cgi-bin/xpr-ddb.pl?q=%E7%9F%A5%E4%BA%8B, last accessed May 14, 2023.

Questions by Maudgalyāyana on Light and Heavy Things in the Vinaya; T 1483, 24), translated during the Eastern Jin Dynasty (317–420), which contains similar advice, in similar wording, in four separate places. However, it is less equivocal than Daoxuan's rendering, as it clearly states that monasteries may accept and utilize gifts of animals (including oxen) and servants that are offered to the Buddha (or to monks) but may not subsequently sell them. All four passages also explicitly prohibit the acceptance of all kinds of weapons (T 1483, 24: 973a24–26; 977b18–19; 984c6–8; 989a17–19).[73] If this text was indeed Daoxuan's source, then we may assume that he was similarly opposed to monastics *trading* in oxen but had no objection to their *presence* in monasteries. That said, his reference may be to an entirely different *Wu bai wen* that has since been lost. For instance, in the introduction to his commentary (T 1804, 40: 3b27), he cites a text entitled *Wu bai wen fa chu yao lü yi* 五百問法出要律儀 (*Five Hundred Questions on the Essence of Vinaya*), compiled under Emperor Liang Wu (r. 502–549), as one of his sources. If this alternative *Wu bai wen* was the source of the ambiguous quote, Daoxuan's intention may have been to argue that gifts of oxen and servants should not be accepted, used, *or* sold.

Evidently, then, the issue of animal donations was far from straightforward for Daoxuan. In one section of the *Sifen lü shanfan buque xingshi chao*, he expresses something approaching outright opposition to the practice; in others, he seems to suggest that certain animals may be accepted provided they serve a useful purpose and are not subsequently sold. Hence, he shifts his focus from donations to trading. Moreover, this somewhat ambivalent attitude toward animals is equally apparent in the *Liang chu qing zhong yi* 量處輕重儀, where Daoxuan discusses monastic property in detail and offers advice on how to deal with goods—including animals—that are offered to the monastic community. In addition to drawing a distinction between domesticated animals (which may be useful economic assets) and wild animals (which should be returned to their original habitats), he creates a third category for creatures that could be used for pest control, such as cats and dogs (a recurring theme in his work, as we saw earlier).[74] His guiding principle is always the protection of all living beings. On domesticated animals, he states:

---

73 For instance: "One can accept and use them, but one cannot sell them" (得受使用。但不得賣; T 1483, 24: 973a25). The same text also states that monasteries should not rear animals (T 1483, 24: 979c16–17; 991b29–c1).

74 For a full discussion of this passage, see Heirman, "How to Treat Animals."

畜諸家畜即駝馬驢牛羊等。并鞍韉秦轡羈縶闌圈槽櫪等。
One keeps domesticated animals, such as camels, horses, donkeys, oxen, and sheep. [One also has items] such as saddles and saddle cloths, bridles and reins,[75] fenced pens and stables. (T 1895, 45: 845b22–23)

家畜之中。既是煩慮之元。宜從重攝。故母論。駝馬驢等可與寺中常住僧運致。已外所有乘具。隨所畜之。如有鞭杖苦具。並須焚蕩。以生譏責故也。
As for [… the issue of] domesticated animals, this is the cause of some difficult considerations. It is appropriate to classify these as heavy goods. In the *Pinimu jing* 毘尼母經 (**Vinaya Mātṛkā Sūtra*) [it is said] that animals such as camels, horses, and donkeys can live in a monastery.[76] The permanent *saṃgha* uses them for traveling.[77] Besides these, other means of transport may be kept in suitable places. As for whips, canes, and other means of inflicting suffering, they should be burned and disposed of since they incur blame. (T 1895, 45: 845b28–c3)

多有車輿。律斷入重。準例下斷 (其例有三)
初常所乘御 (謂水陸船乘牛羊步挽等車輿。并供給船車篙篷繩索等)。
He [a deceased monk] possessed many good chariots. The vinaya defines these as "heavy." This category is analyzed below. (There are three items in this category.) First: vehicles one commonly uses (that means boats on water and vehicles on land, and chariots pulled by means such as oxen or sheep or by [people] on foot. In addition: all kinds of objects

---

75 *Qin pei ji zhi* 秦轡羈縶 (lit. "*Qin* bridles and reins"). The precise meaning of *Qin* (which commonly refers to a region of that name) remains unclear, but it may refer to a distinctive type of tack that was used there.

76 Daoxuan uses the title *Mu lun* 母論 in reference to the *Pinimu jing* 毘尼母經 (T 1463, 24), a vinaya commentary of uncertain affiliation that was translated into Chinese in the second half of the fourth or the start of the fifth century CE (see Clarke, "Vinaya Mātṛkā," for further information). This text allows the "permanent *saṃgha*" (see the following note) to employ elephants, camels, horses, oxen, and donkeys as means of transport (T 1463, 24: 815b15).

77 Earlier in the *Liang chu qing zhong yi* (T 1895, 45: 840a15–16), Daoxuan explains *chang zhu seng* 常住僧 ("permanent *saṃgha*") in opposition to *xianqian seng* 現前僧 ("the *saṃgha* that is present"). Hence, the "permanent *saṃgha*" equates to the so-called *si fang seng* 四方僧 ("order of the four quarters") and refers to the whole community of Buddhist monastics, in contrast to the monastics who belong to a particular monastery. For further details, see Chen, *The Revival of Buddhist Monasticism*, 138–142; and Heirman, "How to Treat Animals."

> supplied for these boats and carriages, such as a boat poles, woven mats, or ropes.)[78] (T 1895, 45: 845c20–21)

Throughout the *Liang chu qing zhong yi*, Daoxuan explains that particular monastic items may be categorized as either "light" (*qing* 輕) or "heavy" (*zhong* 重). According to Huaiyu Chen, for Daoxuan, "light" property generally meant any item that could be distributed among a monastery's monks, whereas "heavy" property belonged to the whole community, the *saṃgha*.[79] Each item is classified as either *ru zhong* 入重 ("it counts as heavy property") or *ru qing* 入輕 ("it counts as light property"). As the second extract testifies, Daoxuan categorizes oxen as "heavy," implying they belong to the community. Still, he felt that no monastic should possess anything that could be used to cause the animals suffering, such as whips or canes.

3.3. Releasing oxen

The vinaya texts' discussions on the release of animals did not go unnoticed by Daoxuan, who includes a short but sharp commentary on the subject in the *Sifen lü shanfan buque xingshi chao* (T 1804, 40: 148a18–27):

> 慈濟畜生法。四分慈心解他被繫狗子。出他被溺豚子。解蘭若處賊繫牛。並不犯。僧祇有神力奪賊物人。放諸禽畜。皆云慈作者不犯。十誦獵師逐畜入寺。從比丘索。比丘言。那得還汝。彼去生疑。佛言不犯。又被射鹿入寺。獵師言。此鹿中箭當更射殺。汝等避箭。諸比丘不與避。亦不與鹿。便呵已去。去後鹿死。佛言。應還獵師。若悲壞羅網及獄但犯吉羅。猪被箭入寺。比丘言何處。又是誰猪。無有猪主。去後白佛。佛言。有如是因緣。當作餘語不犯。
>
> On the rule of treating animals with kindness: in the Dharmaguptaka vinaya, [a monk] released someone else's dog that was tied [to a gate], freed someone else's young pig that was lying in the mud, and released an ox tied up by a bandit in a lonely place (*araṇya*). Each time, [the monk] did not commit an offense. In the Mahāsāṃghika vinaya, [a monk], using his magical powers, took away goods and people from a bandit, and freed all [his] animals. For each action, it is said that, when

78 The other two items are funerary chariots and ritual objects. These lie beyond the scope of this paper, so they are not discussed here.

79 See Chen, *The Revival of Buddhist Monasticism*, 141; and Heirman, "How to Treat Animals."

> done out of kindness, there is no offense. In the Sarvāstivāda vinaya, a hunter pursued an animal into a monastic compound, and then asked the *bhikṣu*s to give it to him. The *bhikṣu*s said: "Why would we return it to you?" When he had gone, [the monks] started to doubt [their decision]. The Buddha said that they did not commit an offense. Furthermore, when a deer that had been wounded entered the compound, the hunter said: "This deer has been hit by an arrow. I must shoot it again and kill it. Now stay out of the way of the arrow." The *bhikṣu*s did not stay out of the way for him, nor did they give him the deer. After [the hunter] had cursed them, he left. When he had gone, the deer died. The Buddha said: "You have to return it [to the hunter]." [Furthermore], when destroying traps and cages out of grief, one only commits a *duṣkṛta*. [Furthermore], a boar, wounded by an arrow, entered a monastic compound, and the *bhikṣu*s said, "Where is he?" and "Whose boar is it? There is no owner of the boar," and then, when [the hunter] had left, they told the Buddha. The Buddha said: "For that reason, you are permitted to say other things; there is no offense."

This passage clearly focuses on protecting animals with a kind heart. First, Daoxuan refers to the three Dharmaguptaka vinaya stories that discuss the release of a dog, a young pig, and an ox.[80] However, he neglects to mention that, while the vinaya concludes that releasing an animal out of kindness is not a *pārājika* offense, it also explicitly states that the monks should not have done so. Thus, his interpretation of the phrase *bu fan* 不犯 ("one does not commit a (*pārājika*) offense") is very broad, to say the least. Moreover, the same liberal interpretation is evident in his analysis of a passage from the Mahāsāṃghika vinaya.[81] Next, Daoxuan turns to two stories from the Sarvāstivāda vinaya. In

---

80 As mentioned earlier, the monks who released the dog and the ox are not adjudged to have committed a *pārājika* offense. In the third story (T 1428, 22: 974a20–26), a monk arrives at a house where a young pig (*tunzi* 豚子) is lying in the mud. It makes a sound and the monk frees it (*chu fang qu* 出放去) out of kindness. Again, the Buddha decrees that releasing the animal is not a *pārājika* offense, but the monk still should not have done it. For further details, see Heirman, "Dangerous and Annoying Animals," 7.

81 Daoxuan does not provide a precise citation, and no passage from the Mahāsāṃghika vinaya perfectly matches his rendering of the story. The most likely candidate is the vinaya's account of a bandit who attacks a village, kidnaps the women and children, and seizes the villagers' property (T 1425, 22: 467b20–c10). The monk Bilingqiepocuo 畢陵伽婆蹉 (Pilindavatsa) uses his magical powers to return everything to the villagers, but his fellow monks then accuse him of stealing

the first, a group of monks are adjudged to have committed no offense after refusing to surrender a deer to a hunter. In the second, Daoxuan acknowledges that the body of fatally wounded deer should have been returned to its rightful owner (the hunter), presumably because the animal could no longer be saved.[82] He then addresses the issue of whether monks should destroy hunters' traps and cages. Although he concludes that this is an offense (presumably because it deprives the hunters of their livelihoods), he categorizes it as only a relatively minor *duṣkṛta*, rather than a more serious *sthūlātyaya* or *pārājika*, as long as it is done "out of grief" (*bei* 悲).[83]

At first glance, the final part of Daoxuan's discussion also seems to refer to the Sarvāstivāda vinaya, as he does not mention any other source. However, this vinaya contains no reference to a group of monks saving a wounded boar. There is a similar story in the Mahīśāsaka vinaya, however (T 1421, 22: 183a7–12). A monk sees a wild boar hit by an arrow while standing in a field. The hunter arrives and asks the monk if he has seen the boar, whereupon the monk replies: "Where is the boar? Whose boar is it? There is no boar." Later, though, the monk wonders if he has committed an offense by refusing to disclose the boar's

---

from the bandit. When the Buddha arrives to investigate the matter, Pilindavatsa defends himself by saying that he acted out of kindness (*ci xin* 慈心) toward the villagers. The Buddha decrees that this was a case of great magical power (*da shen zu* 大神足) and rules that no offense (*wu zui* 無罪) was committed. Daoxuan's account similarly emphasizes the role played by the monk's magical powers. However, he explicitly refers to the release of animals, whereas there is no mention of this in the original Mahāsāṃghika version of the story.

82 Once again, Daoxuan does not quote the source text verbatim. That said, the Sarvāstivāda vinaya (T 1435, 23: 431b12–22) contains very close approximations of both of these stories. In the first, a group of hunters chase a deer into a monastic compound and demand that the monks surrender the animal to them. The monks refuse to do so but then become concerned that they may have committed a *pārājika* offense (by stealing from the hunters). However, the Buddha reassures them with the words *wu zui* 無罪 ("there is no offense"). In the second story, a hunter shoots a deer with an unpoisoned arrow and the deer flees into the monastic compound, whereupon the monks refuse to surrender it to the hunter. Again, the Buddha decrees that no offense has been committed. However, after another hunter shoots a deer with a poisoned arrow and the mortally wounded animal runs into the compound, the monks are told that they should return it to the hunter.

83 The original Sarvāstivāda vinaya ruling is rather more nuanced (T 1435, 23: 431b22–c1). It states that a monk commits a (grave) *sthūlātyaya* offense if he destroys a trap with "a happy heart" (*kuai xin* 快心), but only a *duṣkṛta* offense if he acts with "a kind heart" (*lian min xin* 憐愍心). A similar judgment is reached with respect to destroying tools used by people who catch birds.

whereabouts. The Buddha decrees that the monk did not commit an offense (*bu fan* 不犯) and adds that the monk was right to say "other things" (*yu yu* 餘語)—that is, avoid answering the hunter's question. Finally, to clarify, he declares: "There is no offense at all" (*jie wu zui* 皆無罪). This judgment may be explained by the fact that the boar was no one's property. Moreover, the monk saved its life by withholding information from the hunter.

Kindness—and, if possible, saving and releasing endangered animals—was obviously of the utmost importance to Daoxuan. Nevertheless, as we have seen, he somewhat begrudgingly acknowledges that oxen, along with horses and camels, may be useful additions to a monastery, especially as a means of transport. Hence, in the *Liang chu qing zhong yi*, he permits his fellow monastics to keep them, as long as they suffer no harm.[84]

3.4. The consumption of beef

All types of meat were luxury products that were rarely consumed in medieval Chinese lay society. But even as a luxury product, beef was seldom on the menu. This should come as no surprise, as the Chinese imperial state had firmly opposed the killing of oxen since the start of the Common Era on the grounds that they were essential for agricultural purposes. In addition, there was a gradual decline in the rearing of oxen due to an increasing scarcity of pasture, even though farmers continued to rely on them as draft animals.[85] Finally, there

---

84 Daoxuan does not discuss the use of oxen as plowing animals, probably because he feels that monastics should not engage in any form of agriculture (although he acknowledges that many do; for a discussion, see Heirman, "Protecting Insects," 36–39). Sun ("Sui Tang Chang'an siyuan changsheng chuqin kao," 28–29) has found that some Tang Dynasty monasteries not only kept oxen but rented them out to farmers who did not have the financial means to buy their own (see also Goossaert, *L'interdit du boeuf en Chine*, 90). However, this may have been after Daoxuan's lifetime, since, as pointed out by Sun, monasteries were still routinely criticized for owning cattle in the early Tang period. It was only from the mid-Tang onwards that monastic ownership (and renting out) of so-called *changsheng niu* 長生牛 ("long-life oxen") became commonplace. By then, what may have been the benevolent origins of the term—which reflected the unusually long lives of oxen that were housed in monasteries—must have seemed meaningless as the animals' heavy workloads became indistinguishable from those of their counterparts in secular society.

85 See Goossaert, *L'interdit du boeuf en Chine*, 26–41 and 81–112; and Bray, "Where Did the Animals Go?," 118–127.

was a growing cultural aversion toward the consumption of beef that eventually led to calls for a total ban, particularly from the tenth century onwards.[86]

Daoxuan does not advocate a specific ban on the consumption of beef in his vinaya commentaries. Rather, he pleads for strict vegetarianism, which by his time had already become a strong symbol of Chinese Buddhist identity.[87] Hence, he was a fierce supporter of a total ban on all meat consumption, as he outlines in the *Sifen lü shanfan buque xingshi chao* (T 1804, 40: 118a1–14), primarily with reference to the (Mahāyāna) *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* (an account of the last few days of the Buddha's life) and the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* (purportedly a lesson that Śākyamuni delivered on the island of Laṅkā). These two texts played important roles in the evolution of *tathāgathagarbha* (that is, the notion that all sentient beings possess the essence of Buddhahood)—a concept that softened "the ontological and moral distinctions between humans and other beings."[88] Daoxuan was an ardent champion of this concept, as is evident in the following passage from the *Sifen lü shanfan buque xingshi chao* (T 1804, 40: 141a24):

> 念一切眾生同是佛因。起不殺行。即是敬信信知因果。作長壽緣。
>
> Remember that all living beings are equally endowed with the potential to Buddhahood. That is why we should not kill. This is to respect the teaching, to put trust in the law of cause and effect, and so secure a long life.

---

86 In *L'interdit du boeuf en Chine*, Goossaert argues that the calls for a ban were strongly connected to Chinese traditional culture, as the ox was an essential resource on most small family farms. In a forthcoming study, Meir Shahar focuses on the divinity of the *niu* 牛, which encompasses both buffalo and oxen. (For more on the term *niu* and its implications in China, see also Goossaert, *L'interdit du boeuf en Chine*, 77–78.) Shahar explains that late-imperial China considered the ox/buffalo as a Buddhist deity that had descended to earth specifically to pull the plow. He traces the origins of this belief to ancient India, with Buddhism serving as "a vehicle introducing the Indian inviolability of the cattle to China." See https://www.ames.cam.ac.uk/whats-on/yin-cheng-distinguished-lecture-series-yin-zheng-fo-xue-jie-chu-xue-shu-xi-lie-jiang-zuo-0, last accessed May 14, 2023.

87 For an introduction to Chinese Buddhist vegetarianism, see, among others, Kieschnick, "Buddhist Vegetarianism in China"; and Greene, "Early History of Chinese Buddhist Vegetarianism."

88 Campany, *Strange Writing*, 389–390. For details on *tathāgathagarbha* in the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* and the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*, see Nakamura, *Indian Buddhism*, 229–233.

When discussing the consumption of meat, Daoxuan first cites the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* in support of his argument that all animal flesh should be avoided out of compassion for all sentient beings (T 1804, 40: 118a2–5).[89] He then enumerates ten reasons why meat should not be consumed (T 1804, 40: 118a6–14), echoing the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* (T 670, 16: 513c14–16).[90] He explicitly mentions dogs, foxes, people, and horses in his version of the second of these ten reasons, which focuses on butchery and selling meat. The inclusion of people may seem rather incongruous, but Daoxuan's intention may have been to underscore that *all* sentient beings are precious, so none should be slaughtered and eaten.[91] He stresses that there are no exceptions to this rule, and highlights the karmic consequences of killing any living creature (T 1804, 40: 118a15–17):

> 故屠者販賣但爲食肉之人。必無食者亦不屠殺。故知食者同屠造業。沾殺生分。可不誡乎。
> A butcher sells only to those who eat meat; if there is no one to eat his meat, he will not slaughter. Thus, we see that he who eats meat creates bad karma along with the butcher, and is also stained by the act of killing. Let this serve as warning.[92]

3.5. The consumption of cows' milk

While meat was clearly banned, other animal produce was not. For instance, contrary to popular belief, dairy products were widely known in Tang China,

---

89 Daoxuan relies on the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, T 374, 12: 386a12–16; b10–12; T 375, 12: 626a7–10; b6–9.

90 See *Lengqieaboduoluo bao jing* 楞伽阿跋多羅寶經 (T 670, 16; *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*), translated by Guṇabhadra (394–468; cf. Demiéville et al., *Répertoire du canon bouddhique*, 252), specifically T 670, 16: 513c10–514c2. For more details on the use of the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* in guidelines on the consumption of meat, see also Heirman and De Rauw, "Offenders, Sinners and Criminals," 64–71.

91 Both the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* (T 670, 16: 513c15) and Daoxuan's commentary (T 1804, 40: 118a8–9) state that the butcher sells these types of meat in a *za* 雜 way. Above, I have interpreted this as "in an indiscriminate way," meaning that he sells the meat of all kinds of sentient beings. However, as an anonymous reader astutely pointed out, *za* could equally imply that the butcher "mixes" different types of meat, including human flesh. Either way, though, it is clear that human flesh forms part of the butcher's merchandise, and that many animals, including humans, are killed to produce meat.

92 Translation by Kieschnick, "Buddhist Vegetarianism in China," 202.

used frequently in medicinal as well as culinary contexts,[93] and even viewed as precious commodities.[94] A most interesting source on this phenomenon is the famous agricultural treatise *Qimin yaoshu* 齊民要術 (*Techniques for Conditioning People's Livelihood*), compiled by Jia Sixie 賈思勰 (fl. 544) in the first half of the sixth century. In her detailed study of this treatise, Françoise Sabban explains that milk (*ru* 乳), specifically from cows and sheep, was treated to obtain two commodities with much longer shelf lives: fermented milk (*lao* 酪) and butter (*su* 酥). The butter could then be simmered (*jian* 煎) to purify it further and obtain a product that probably resembled what is known as *tihu* 醍醐 in later texts.[95] Therefore, it is unsurprising that milk was widely admired, not only in agricultural contexts, but even at the imperial court. This is evident in the report of a conversation between Emperor Gaozu 高祖 (r. 471–499) and Wang Su 王肅 (463–501), an official from southern China, that appears in the *Luoyang qielan ji* 洛陽伽藍記 (*A Record of Buddhist Monasteries in Luoyang*; T 2092, 51), compiled by Yang Xuanzhi 楊衒之 (d. 555) in the mid-sixth century. Comparing northern and southern eating habits, Wang Su declares, "[T]ea is no match; it is a slave of fermented milk (*lao* 酪)" (T 2092, 51: 1011c1).[96]

That said, it is difficult to know the extent to which dairy products were consumed by Buddhist monastics, even though Daoxuan is certainly aware of references to them in the vinaya texts. For instance, in a brief discussion of medicines that monastics may use for up to seven days, he cites the aforementioned list in the Dharmaguptaka vinaya: ghee, oil, fresh butter, honey, and syrup (T 1804, 40: 118b20–21). He also mentions using milk to cure a

93 For references to milk in medicines, see, in particular, Despeux, "Chinese Medicinal Excrement," 145–147.

94 On the popularity of dairy products in medieval China, see, among others, Sabban, "Un savoir-faire oublié: le travail du lait en Chine ancienne" and "The Taste for Milk," 183–185; Li et al., *Zhongguo naiye shi*, 46–51; and Kotyk, "Milk, Yogurt and Butter," 2–5.

95 See Sabban, "Un savoir-faire oublié: le travail du lait en Chine ancienne," 36–42. The terms *lao* and *su* might refer to slightly different products from those mentioned in the Dharmaguptaka vinaya (see above), given the different contexts of India and China. The *Qimin yaoshu* also discusses the use of horses' and donkeys' milk.

96 See Kieschnick, *The Impact of Buddhism*, 264–265. For a full translation of the above conversation, see Wang, *A Record of Buddhist Monasteries in Lo-yang*, 141–142.

mouth disease (T 1804, 40: 90c3).[97] Unfortunately, neither of these passages sheds much light on the prevalence of dairy products in Tang monasteries, although more hints are provided when Daoxuan discusses milk in relation to the Buddhist principle of not harming animals.

In his *Sifen lü shanfan buque xingshi chao*, Daoxuan clearly states that monastics should never beg for silk, just as they should not beg for blood, meat, or milk (T 1804, 40: 69a14–19; 84b16–19). Given that he perceives sericulture and the consumption of meat as extremely harmful to animal life, it is safe to assume that he views dairy farming in a similarly dim light.[98] Moreover, he returns to this theme in another text, the *Shimen zhangfu yi* 釋門章服儀 (*Practices on Monastic Clothing*; T 1894, 25: 836c18–22):

> 存生之務誠重。至於放火焚山。引水溉地。翻覆殺傷。殘害逾甚。況復囚犢捋乳。劫蜂賊蜜。蟲豸之封菜蔬。蠅蛹之依食器。薪水生靈。過於倉粟。草土含識。同聚成村。身口所經。寔難無患。
>
> The task of preserving life is very challenging. Not to mention the casualties when setting the wood on the hills on fire [for land clearance], when draining water and irrigating fields, and when plowing [the soil]. One also cruelly injures [living beings] to a great extent when caging calves and milking [cows], or when plundering bees and stealing their honey.[99] [Have we ever spared a thought] for the vegetables that insects and reptiles rely upon, or the food that flies and pupae depend on? The living beings in firewood and water are innumerable. The living beings that reside in grass and soil are as numerous as the people who gather in a village. But if we look at what passes through our bodies and mouths, then it is really difficult not to cause them any harm.

Once again, this text enumerates a series of harmful practices, including dairy farming. Although it cannot be considered as definitive proof that milk and other dairy products were widely used in Tang monasteries, it certainly suggests that the practice was well known, and Daoxuan clearly articulates what he

---

97 Several Dunhuang manuscripts compiled during the Tang Dynasty also contain references to the medicinal use of milk and associated products. In a study, Catherine Despeux ("Chinese Medicinal Excrement," 145–147) provides a list of prescriptions that include milk and butter.

98 On silk, see, in particular, Young, "Bald-headed Destroyers of Living Things" and "Squealing Silkworms"; and Heirman, "Protecting Insects," 39–43.

99 On honey, see Heirman, "Protecting Insects," 43–45.

perceives as an act of cruelty: depriving calves of their mothers' milk.[100] Sabban calculates that calves were permitted to drink no more than about a third of the milk produced by their mothers,[101] with humans consuming the rest. Daoxuan's message seems to be that this could—and should—be avoided, although he does acknowledge that humans are likely to cause some harm to some living beings regardless of what they feed themselves.

3.6. The use of cow dung

It seems that medieval Chinese monastics had fewer uses for cow dung than their predecessors in India. Daoxuan does mention it occasionally, such as when recommending its use as a patching material to restore damaged buildings (T 1804, 40: 76c24–28), in line with advice given in the Dharmaguptaka vinaya (T 1428, 22: 641b20–24).[102] Similarly, he echoes the same vinaya (T 1428, 22: 953a19–25 and T 1428, 22: 932b19–21, respectively) when advocating it as a cleaning agent for begging bowls and one's own hands after urination or defecation (T 1804, 40: 126a7–8 and T 1804, 40: 148a12–13, respectively). However, this does not necessarily mean that Chinese monasteries actually used cow dung for these purposes.[103] Daoxuan offers no clear evidence either way, although it is safe to assume that his fellow Chinese Buddhists did find some uses for it. For instance, in a detailed study, Catherine Despeux concludes that Buddhism (influenced by Āyurvedic medicine) played a key role in Chinese medical practitioners' increasing use of cow dung during the Tang Dynasty.[104]

---

100 Moreover, the adult cows may have suffered more than just separation from their offspring. Sabban ("Un savoir-faire oublié: le travail du lait en Chine ancienne," 47) suggests that farmers attempted to increase milk yield by stamping on their cows' udders. Good milk from cows (and other animals) was important to ensure good offspring (see Knapp, "The Use and Understanding of Domestic Animals," 97–98).

101 See Sabban, "Un savoir-faire oublié: le travail du lait en Chine ancienne," 46–47. She suggests that the same was true of sheep and lambs.

102 The vinayas mention that rodents often chew holes in monastic floors and walls. See Heirman, "What about Rats," 5.

103 In contrast to earth and ashes, cow dung is not mentioned as a standard cleaning agent in texts on cleaning practices in Chinese monasteries. See Heirman and Torck, *A Pure Mind in a Clean Body*, 87.

104 See Despeux, "Chinese Medicinal Excrement." See also Giddings, "The Sūtra on the Dhāraṇī," 273–274 (on the treatment of blisters and eye infections) and Stanley-Baker and Yang, "Dung, Hair and Mungbeans," 454–477 (on the treatment of a variety of diseases). In addition, Roel Sterckx ("Excreted and Left Untreated,"

Indeed, they relied on animal excrement when treating everything from sores, abscesses, and wounds to contagious diseases.[105] Nevertheless, such practices did not go uncontested. For example, in his travelogue *Nanhai jigui neifa zhuan* 南海寄歸內法傳 (*Record of the Inner Law Sent Home from the South Seas*; T 2125, 54), the famous monk Yijing reports seeing excrement used as a curative in several Indian monasteries. However, he views this practice as impure, and suggests it should be banned (T 2125, 54: 225a13–15):

> 自有方處鄙俗久行。病發即服大便小便。疾起便用猪糞猫糞。或堄盛瓮貯號曰龍湯雖加美名穢惡斯極。
> There are places where something vulgar has been practiced for a long time. When people become ill, they take excrement and urine [as medicine]. When an illness arises, they rely on the excrement of pigs or of cats. Sometimes they pour it in an earthen jug or store it in an earthen jar. They call it "dragon decoction." Although it has a beautiful name, it is most filthy and loathsome.[106]

Yijing admits that dung sourced from calves, or urine from adult cows, may be used without contravening vinaya guidelines (T 2125, 54: 225a22), but he then warns that those who use it extensively run the risk of excluding themselves from society (T 2125, 54: 225a22–27). Moreover, he suggests that doing so undermines the reputation of the Dharma. Instead, monks should use some of the many widely available fragrant herbs (T 2125, 54: 225a27–29):

> 勿令流俗習以爲常。外國若聞誠損風化。又復大有香藥何不服之。
> On must not cause this vulgar habit to spread and thereby become a regular custom. If [people from] foreign countries hear of this, it will truly damage [China's] cultural impact. Furthermore, there is an abundance of fragrant [medicinal] herbs—why should we not use these?[107]

We may assume that Daoxuan was no great admirer of cow dung eithersince he rarely mentions it. One final instance is in a list of products that monks may use

---

138–139) demonstrates that excrement was used in Chinese drugs prior to the arrival of Buddhism, although this increased during the Tang Dynasty.

105 For details, see Despeux, "Chinese Medicinal Excrement," 144–145 and 154–161.

106 After Kleine, "Health Care in Indian Monasteries," 154 (with minor changes). See also Despeux, "Chinese Medicinal Excrement," 152.

107 After Kleine, "Health Care in Indian Monasteries," 155 (with minor changes).

when dyeing their robes (T 1804, 40: 105c7–8), for which his source is the Mahāsāṃghika vinaya (T 1425, 22: 454c26). However, some centuries later, the sub-commentator Yuanzhao 元照 (1048–1116) saw fit to challenge even this seemingly innocuous suggestion:[108]

> 巨摩即牛糞。西土牛食香草人所貴之。此方不宜故不應用。
> *Jumo* 巨摩 (*goma*[*ya*]) means cow dung. In western regions, cows feed on fragrant herbs. Therefore, people consider them to be valuable. In these regions, it is not suitable. Therefore, one should not use it.

Clearly, then, at least some prominent vinaya masters continued to view cow dung as an impure substance that should be avoided to safeguard the reputation of the Buddhist *saṃgha*.

4. Conclusion

Both the vinaya texts and Daoxuan's commentaries on them discuss oxen in some detail. However, although the disciplinary texts are obviously Daoxuan's principal source material, he does not address all the points they raise. For instance, with regard to oxen, his focus is clearly on their role as domesticated animals that are useful to monastics in some (limited) circumstances.

The vinaya texts' perception of oxen is rather ambivalent. At times, along with a number of other animals, they are closely associated with impropriety and filth, particularly on account of their messy eating habits and the vulgar way in which they relieve themselves. Monastics who mirror such coarse behavior are likely to damage the image of the *saṃgha*, its members, and its teachings. Yet, at other times, the vinayas acknowledge that oxen can be very useful. For instance, they pull plows and, importantly, help monastics to cross rivers. Then there are the valuable commodities they produce: beef, leather, dairy products, and dung. The vinayas' discussions on the consumption of beef are broadly in line with the Buddhist stance on meat eating in general: monastics should accept and consume such gifts only on condition that the animal has not been killed with the express intention of donating its meat to members of the *saṃgha*. Some vinaya texts extend this principle to the use of leather, at least in the touching story of a monk who covets the hide of a young calf. There are

---

108 Yuanzhao, Sifen *lü xingshi chao zichi ji* 四分律行事鈔資持記 (*Supporting Notes on the Sifen lü xingshi chao*), T 1805, 40: 362a3–4. See also Despeux, "Chinese Medicinal Excrement," 157.

regular hints that the monk asked for the skin of a *living* animal, and thus demanded its death for his benefit. Strikingly, all vinayas pay particularly close attention to the heartbreaking reaction of the calf's mother. Her keening resembles that of a distressed human, as might be heard when a mother witnesses the death of her innocent child, and as such is a powerful reminder of the bonds between all sentient beings. Nevertheless, the vinayas do not call for a complete ban on the use of leather; indeed, they permit monastics to fashion it into a variety of items, such as shoes.

Sympathy toward animals is also evident in vinaya passages that discuss the release of animals, including oxen. If done out of kindness, these are viewed as good deeds. That said, they may still be considered offenses if rightful owners are deprived of their property.

Finally, the vinayas discuss the use of dairy products and cow dung. Some of them explicitly state that monastics may consume milk, even if there is a chance it has been contaminated with (calves') saliva—potentially an impure substance. Indeed, the message seems to be that monastics are permitted to share the milk with the calves. Milk also forms the basis for a series of dairy products, many of which are used as medicines. Thus, the attitude toward milk and dairy products is generally positive. By contrast, perceptions of cow dung are decidedly mixed. Although recommended as a cleaning agent, and as a patching material when repairing damaged buildings, it is often shunned as a filthy substance. Moreover, tiny insects that are residing within cow dung are likely to be burned alive if it is used as fuel for fires. As a result, its use is often criticized.

Daoxuan's focus on oxen as domesticated animals reflects one of his primary concerns—namely, that no sentient being should ever be harmed, let alone killed. Yet, while this principle leads him to the conclusion that certain creatures—such as cats, dogs, and wild animals—have no place in a monastery, he does not advocate an outright ban on oxen. Instead, although he remains opposed to the restraint of any animal, he accepts that monastics should be permitted to keep oxen (and some other animals) on account of their utility. That said, he refuses to countenance trading in the animals, and insists that they must remain unharmed at all times.

As for products related to oxen, in addition to being a strict vegetarian, and highlighting the dire karmic repercussions of killing any living creature, Daoxuan voices some doubts over the consumption of cows' milk, as this is produced by (cruelly) separating the calves from their mothers. On the other hand, he acknowledges that humans almost invariably cause harm to some

sentient beings whenever they feed themselves. Interestingly, in contrast to his near-contemporary Yijing and the Song Dynasty monk Yuanzhao, Daoxuan expresses no strong opinions on the subject of cow dung. Nevertheless, it seems safe to assume that he was not a strong supporter of its widespread use, given the level of repulsion it could generate and therefore the negative impact it could have on the reputation of the *saṃgha*.

In summary, it is clear the principles of non-killing and non-harming—essential identity markers of the Buddhist *saṃgha*—were of the utmost importance to Daoxuan. Hence, while he acknowledges that domesticated oxen can be of some use to monastics, he maintains that they should always be treated with kindness, in accord with one of the major tenets of Buddhist teaching.

References

Abbreviations

T *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大蔵經. 85 vols., edited by Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡邊海旭. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924–1934.

Vin *Vinaya Piṭakaṃ: One of the Principal Buddhist Holy Scriptures in the Pāli Language.* 5 vols., edited by Herman Oldenberg, 1879–1883. Reprint, London: Pali Text Society, 1969–1993.

Barrett, Tim. *The Religious Affiliations of the Chinese Cat: An Essay towards an Anthropozoological Approach to Comparative Religion* (Louis Jordan Occasional Papers in Comparative Religion 2). London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 1998.

———. "The Monastery Cat in Cross-cultural Perspective: Cat Poems of the Zen Masters." In *Buddhist Monasticism in East Asia: Places of Practice*, edited by James Benn, Lori Meeks, and James Robson, 107–124. London: Routledge, 2010.

Barrett, Tim and Mark Strange. "Walking by Itself: The Singular History of the Chinese Cat." In *Animals through Chinese History: Earliest Times to 1911*, edited by Roel Sterckx, Martina Siebert, and Dagmar Schäfer, 84–98. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.

Bintsis, Thomas and Photis Papademas. "The Evolution of Fermented Milks, from Artisanal to Industrial Products: A Critical Review." *Fermentation* 8, no. 679 (2022). https://www.mdpi.com/2311-5637/8/12/679.

Bray, Francesca. "Where Did the Animals Go? Presence and Absence of Livestock in Chinese Agricultural Treatises." In *Animals through Chinese History: Earliest Times to 1911*, edited by Roel Sterckx, Martina Siebert, and Dagmar Schäfer, 118–138. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.

Campany, Robert. *Strange Writing: Anomaly Accounts in Early Medieval China*. New York: State University of New York Press, 1996.

Chen, Huaiyu. *The Revival of Buddhist Monasticism in Medieval China*. New York: Peter Lang, 2007.

Clarke, Shayne. "Vinaya Mātṛkā—Mother of the Monastic Codes, or Just Another Set of Lists? A Response to Frauwallner's Handling of the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 47, no. 2 (2004): 77–120.

———. "Vinayas." In *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, Vol. 1: *Literatures and Languages*, edited by Jonathan A. Silk, 60–87. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Collins, Steven. “The Body in Theravāda Buddhist Monasticism.” In *Religion and the Body*, edited by Sarah Coakley, 185–204 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Dantinne, Jean. *Les qualités de l’ascète (Dhutaguṇa), étude sémantique et doctrinale*. Bruxelles: Thang-Long, 1991.

Demiéville, Paul, Hubert Durt, and Anna Seidel. *Répertoire du canon bouddhique sino-japonais, édition de Taishō (Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō).* Paris: Librairie d’Amérique et d’Orient; Tokyo: Maison Franco-Japonaise, 1978.

Despeux, Catherine. “Chinese Medicinal Excrement: Is There a Buddhist Influence on the Use of Animal Excrement-based Recipes in Medieval China?” *Asian Medicine* 12 (2017): 139–169.

Dessein, Bart. *Saṃyuktābhidharmahṛdaya, Heart of Scholasticism with Miscellaneous Additions*. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1999.

Giddings, William J. “The Sūtra on the Dhāraṇī of the Vast, Complete, and Unobstructed Great Compassion of the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara with a Thousand Hands and Thousand Eyes.” In *Buddhism and Medicine: An Anthology of Premodern Sources*, edited by C. Pierce Salguero, 252–285. New York: Columbia University Press, 2017.

Goossaert, Vincent. *L’interdit du boeuf en Chine: agriculture, éthique et sacrifice*. Paris: Collège de France: Institut des hautes études chinoises, 2005.

Greene, Eric. “A Reassessment of the Early History of Chinese Buddhist Vegetarianism.” *Asia Major* 29 (2016): 1–43.

Heirman, Ann. *The Discipline in Four Parts: Rules for Nuns According to the Dharmaguptakavinaya.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2002.

———. “Vinaya from India to China.” In *The Spread of Buddhism*, edited by Ann Heirman and Stephan-Peter Bumbacher, 167–202. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

———. “Shoes in Buddhist Monasteries from India to China: From Practical Attire to Symbol.” *Acta Orientalia* 69, no. 4 (2016): 411–439.

———. “How to Deal with Dangerous and Annoying Animals: A *Vinaya* Perspective.” *Religions* 10, no. 113 (2019). https://www.mdpi.com/2077-1444/10/2/113/htm.

———. “Protecting Insects in Medieval Chinese Buddhism: Daoxuan’s *Vinaya* Commentaries.” *Buddhist Studies Review* 37, no. 1 (2020): 27–52.

———. “What about Rats? Buddhist Disciplinary Guidelines on Rats: Daoxuan’s *Vinaya* Commentaries.” *Religions* 12, no. 7 (2021). https://www.mdpi.com/2077-1444/12/7/508/htm.

———. “Buddhist Monastics and (Their) Dogs: Daoxuan’s *Vinaya* Commentaries.” Forthcoming.

———. “How to Treat Animals in a Chinese Buddhist Monastery: Daoxuan’s Views on Animals in a Monastic Environment.” Forthcoming.

Heirman, Ann and Tom De Rauw. “Offenders, Sinners and Criminals: The Consumption of Forbidden Food.” *Acta Orientalia* 59 (2006): 57–83.

Heirman, Ann and Mathieu Torck. *A Pure Mind in a Clean Body: Bodily Care in the Buddhist Monasteries of Ancient India and China*. Gent: Academia Press, 2012.

Hinüber, Oskar von. *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1996.

Kieffer-Pülz, Petra. “Stretching the *Vinaya* Rules and Getting Away with It.” *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 29 (2007): 1–49.

Kieschnick, John. *The Impact of Buddhism on Chinese Material Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.

———. “Buddhist Vegetarianism in China.” In *Of Tripod and Palate: Food, Politics, and Religion in Traditional China*, edited by Roel Sterckx, 186–212. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Kleine, Christoph. “Health Care in Indian Monasteries: Selections from Yijing’s *Record of the Inner Law Sent Home from the Southern Seas*.” In *Buddhism and Medicine: An Anthology of Premodern Sources*, edited by C. Pierce Salguero, 145–159. New York: Columbia University Press, 2017.

Knapp, Keith N. “The Use and Understanding of Domestic Animals in Early Medieval Northern China.” *Early Medieval China* 25 (2019): 85–99.

Kotyk, Jeffrey. “Milk, Yogurt and Butter in Medieval East Asia: Dairy Products from China to Japan in Medicine and Buddhism.” *Religions* 12, no. 302 (2021). https://www.mdpi.com/2077-1444/12/5/302.

Li Chengguo 刘成果 et al., eds. *Zhongguo naiye shi* 中国奶业史 (*History of China’s Dairy Industry*). Beijing: Zhongguo nongye 中国农业出版社, 2013.

Monier-Williams, Monier. *A Sanskrit–English Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990 [first edition: Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1899].

Muller, Charles, ed. *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism* (1995–). http://www.buddhism-dict.net/ddb/.

Nakamura, Hajime. *Indian Buddhism: A Survey with Bibliographical Notes.* New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1987 [first edition: Hirakata: Kansai University of Foreign Studies, 1980].

Pinte, Gudrun. “Lost in Translation: A Case Study of Sanghabhadra’s *Shanjian lü piposha*.” Ph.D. Diss., Ghent University, 2011.

Potter, Karl. *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*, Vol. 8: *Buddhist Philosophy from 100 to 350 AD*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1999.

Rhys Davids, Thomas William and William Stede. *The Pali Text Society's Pali–English Dictionary*. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1992 [first edition: 1921–1925].

Sabban, Françoise. "Un savoir-faire oublié: le travail du lait en Chine ancienne." *Zinbun. Memoirs of the Research Institute for Humanistic Studies* 21 (1986): 31–65.

———. "The Taste for Milk in Modern China (1865–1937)." In *Food Consumption in Global Perspective: Essays in the Anthropology of Food in Honour of Jack Goody*, edited by Jakob Klein and Anne Murcott, 182–208. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Schmithausen, Lambert. *The Problem of the Sentience of Plants in Earliest Buddhism*. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1991.

———. *Fleischverzehr und Vegetarismus im indischen Buddhismus bis ca. zur Mitte des ersten Jahrtausends n. Chr.* Bochum/Freiburg: projektverlag, 2020.

Schmithausen, Lambert and Mudagamuwe Maithrimurthi. "Attitudes towards Animals in Indian Buddhism." In *Penser, dire et représenter l'animal dans le monde indien*, edited by Nalini Balbir and Georges-Jean Pinault, 47–121. Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion, 2009.

Schopen, Gregory. "Cross-dressing with the Dead: Asceticism, Ambivalence, and Institutional Values in an Indian Monastic Code." In *The Buddhist Dead: Practices, Discourses, Representations*, edited by Bryan J. Cuevas and Jacqueline Ilyse Stone, 60–104. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2007.

Shahar, Meir. "The Indian Buddhist Origins of the Chinese Beef Taboo" (2023). https://www.ames.cam.ac.uk/whats-on/yin-cheng-distinguished-lecture-series-yin-zheng-fo-xue-jie-chu-xue-shu-xi-lie-jiang-zuo-0.

Shih Heng-ching Bhikṣuṇī. *The Sutra on Upāsaka Precepts.* Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 1994.

Stanley-Baker, Michael and Dolly Yang. "Dung, Hair and Mungbeans: Household Remedies in the Longmen Recipes." In *Buddhism and Medicine: An Anthology of Premodern Sources*, edited by C. Pierce Salguero, 455–477. New York: Columbia University Press, 2017.

Sterckx, Roel. "Excreted and Left Untreated? Human and Animal Waste: From Dunhuang to Laozi." *East Asian Science, Technology and Medicine* 55 (2023): 116–156.

Sun Yinggang 孙英刚. "Sui Tang Chang'an siyuan changsheng chuqin kao" 隋唐长安寺院长生畜禽考 ("Research on 'Long Life Animals' in the Chang'an Monasteries of the Sui and Tang Dynasties). *Shijie zongjiao yanjiu* 世界宗教研究 (*Studies in World Religion*) 2013, no. 2: 25–36.

Wang Yi-t'ung, transl. *A Record of Buddhist Monasteries in Lo-yang by Yang Hsüan-chih*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Witkowski, Nicholas. “Pāṃśukūlika as a Standard Practice in the Vinaya.” In *Rules of Engagement: Medieval Traditions of Buddhist Monastic Regulation*, edited by Susan Andrews, Jinhua Chen, and Cuilan Liu, 269–316. Hamburg: projektverlag, 2017.

Wu Zeyan 吳澤炎, Huang Qiuyun 黃秋耘, and Liu Yeqiu 劉葉秋, eds. *Ciyuan* 辭源: *Xiu ding ben* 修訂本. Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1986 [first edition: 1979–1983].

Young, Stuart. “‘Bald-headed Destroyers of Living Things’: Buddhist Identity in the Silk Cultures of Medieval China.” Asia Major (3rd series) 30, no. 2 (2017): 27–70.

———. “Squealing Silkworms, Bug Clothes and Maidens who Spit Silk: Indian Silk and Sericulture in Medieval Chinese Buddhism.” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 42 (2019): 633–678.

Yuyama, Akira. *A Systematic Survey of Buddhist Sanskrit Literature, Erster Teil: Vinaya-Texte*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1979.

Zou, Ang. *The Life of Daoxuan, According to Others and in His Own Words*. Singapore: Buddhist College of Singapore and Kong Meng San Phor Kark See Monastery, 2019.