



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## **Forbidden Women: A Peculiar Buddhist Reference**

Silk, J.A.; Zieme P

### **Citation**

Silk, J. A. (2008). *Forbidden Women: A Peculiar Buddhist Reference*. Turnhout: Brepols.  
Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/16447>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/16447>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

## Forbidden Women

### A Peculiar Buddhist Reference

Jonathan A. Silk

When dealing with allowable relations, Indian legal literature concerns itself both with restrictions on whom one may marry, and on those with whom one may have sex. While normative Indian Buddhist literature has virtually no explicit interest in the former category, it does preserve stipulations regarding the latter, at least one of which is framed in particularly interesting terms.

The *Daśākuśalakarmapatha*, of uncertain date (attributed apocryphally to the poet Aśvaghoṣa, otherwise to Atiśa),<sup>1</sup> is available in a Sanskrit fragment, in two Tibetan translations, one in prose and one in verse, and in Chinese. Tacitly assuming, like virtually all such literature, the male standpoint, it offers a brief passage listing those whom one may not approach sexually:<sup>2</sup>

agamyā<sup>1</sup> nāma sarvā parastrī dharmadhvajā gotrarakṣitā gṛhītapaṇyā veśyā krīti-sambandhinī tiryāṇcaś ceti evaṃ svavanitām<sup>2</sup> api sevayan kāmamithyācārī bhavati  
1) Lévi prints the manuscript as *agamyo* (similarly, a few lines above read *agamyās* for *agamyas*). 2) Lévi reads *svavatitām*.

The corresponding Tibetan prose translation reads:<sup>3</sup>

'gro bar<sup>1</sup> bya ba ma yin pa ni | gzhan gyi bud med thams cad dang | chos kyi<sup>2</sup> rgyal  
mtshan dang rigs kyis bsrungs pa dang | rgyal pos bsrungs pa dang | gzhan gyis  
blangs pa'i smad 'tshong ma dang | gnyen 'brel can dang | byol song ngo || de ltar  
rang gi chung ma la brten<sup>3</sup> nas 'dod pas log par g.yem par 'gyur ro ||

1) Pek. 5355 *bgrad par* 2) Pek. 5355, D *dang* 3) Pek. 5396 (perhaps better): *la'ang bsten*.

<sup>1</sup> See Cordier 1905: Mdo XXXI.21, XXXIII.19, XXXIII.39, XCIV.23. Mochizuki in Mochizuki and Kanno 1996 gives special attention to the question of authorship, tentatively concluding from a variety of evidence that the *Daśākuśalakarmapatha* predates Atiśa, but cannot be the work of the poet Aśvaghoṣa either, and thus is to be attributed to some, so far unknown, third author.

<sup>2</sup> Lévi 1929: 269. The text is translated with notes in Mochizuki and Kanno 1996.

<sup>3</sup> Peking Tanjur 5355, *dbu ma*, ki 357b2-4 = 5396, *dbu ma*, gi 40a8-b2 = Derge Tanjur 3958, *dbu ma*, khi 307a7-b1. Trivial variants are ignored.

The verse version of the same reads as follows:<sup>4</sup>

| bgrod<sup>1</sup> par bya min zhes bya ni<sup>2</sup> |  
gzhan bzung chos kyi rgyal mtshan ldan		rigs kyis bsrungs dang rgyal mor gnas
gzhan gyis blangs dang smad 'tshong dang		nye du dag dang 'brel pa ni
de dag bgrod bya min pa yin		rnam pa de dag rnams la ni
rang gi chung ma bsten pa yang		'dod log spyod<sup>3</sup> par 'gyur pa yin

1) Pek. 5678 'grod 2) Pek. 5678 ste 3) Pek. 5416, 5678 spyad.

The Chinese translation, which differs from the Sanskrit (and Tibetan) in several respects, reads as follows:<sup>5</sup>

非往者。謂於他妻、及比丘尼、親族異趣、及街賣等、設自境界、作非梵行。所不應理、如上當知。

The first portion of the Sanskrit text is not particularly difficult to understand:<sup>6</sup>

Those women whom one is forbidden to approach are: every wife of another, a female renunciant, one protected by [members of] her lineage, a prostitute who has been purchased by accepting a fee, a relative, and animals.

The Tibetan translations follow the Sanskrit closely, save that after “one protected by [members of] her lineage” they add “one protected by the king,” and they interpret the next item as “a prostitute who is kept by another.” The Chinese gives “another’s wife,” perhaps to preserve the four character phrase not noting the plural, interprets the Indic “female renunciant” as “nun” *bhikṣuṇī*, and the following item as “a relative,” the next possibly as “[one belonging to] a different destiny,” indicating an animal (?), and finally adds “prostitute and so

<sup>4</sup> Peking Tanjur 5416, *dbu ma, gi*, 105b4-5 = 5678, *spring yig*, 275b8-276a2 = Derge Tanjur 4178, *spring yig*, nge 35a3-4.

<sup>5</sup> T. 727 (XVII) 457c24-26.

<sup>6</sup> Sherburne 2000: 491 translated this from Tibetan as follows: “As to the ‘improper creatures’: all wives of others, those forbidden by caste and the royal mark of dharma (monk’s robes) (D[erge]: by caste, royal mark, and dharma), those forbidden by the king, a prostitute procured by another, close relatives, and animals. Thus, even being faithful to one’s own wife there could be improper intercourse because of one’s lust.” Lévi 1929: 270: “Interdit: . . . . [his ellipses] la femme d’autrui, celle qui a la bannière de la Loi, qui est gardée par son nom de famille, qui a été achetée, une courtisane. . . . . [his ellipses] et les animaux.” Mochizuki and Kanno 1996: 5: 非往と名づけられるものは、一切の他人の妻・法幢・種族に護られた女・金銭により取られた女・娼婦・買われた関係の女・畜生とである。是の如くに、自らの女と性交することも、邪淫行である。

on.” This is again, while slightly different from the Indic text, not particularly troublesome.

The final sentence of the Sanskrit text, however, is less transparent.<sup>7</sup> The key term is *svavanitā*, to which corresponds Tibetan *rang gi chung ma*, the obvious meaning of which is “one’s own wife.”<sup>8</sup> Syntactically, it would seem to make sense to translate the phrase *iti evaṃ svavanitām api sevayan kāmamithyācārī bhavati* something like: “In this light, if one were to resort even to one’s own wife, this constitutes sexual misconduct.” If correct, this understanding would appear to forbid relations even with one’s own wife, and could conceivably be interpreted as expressing the rather radical view that even leading the household life one should commit oneself to celibacy.<sup>9</sup>

However, the possibility of this reading being correct is vanishingly small.<sup>10</sup> In the first place, by explicitly saying at the outset that one is forbidden sexual relations with the wife of another, the text assumes that sexual relations with one’s own wife are perfectly acceptable. Then, why add the last sentence at all? Following the suggestion of Harunaga Isaacson, “One could imagine some hairsplitting arguments with one side playing the devil’s advocate and arguing that if sex with one’s own wife is allowed, then one would be allowed to have sex with one’s mother (for instance; or a cow, say, ...) if one has married her.” This (albeit somewhat absurd) possibility, which nevertheless occurs to the śāstric mind, is naturally to be rejected. The final sentence should, therefore, be understood as follows:

Thus, if one were to resort [to any of the females listed, beginning with a female renunciant], even [in the otherwise legally acceptable circumstance of taking her as] one’s own wife, this will [nevertheless still] constitute sexual misconduct.

The sacrament of marriage, the author is going out of his way to say, while it makes legal sexual relations with an (otherwise perhaps prohibited) unmarried girl, cannot correspondingly validate such relations with any female otherwise prohibited to one. In this sense the clarification makes perfect sense, relying as it does implicitly on notions of the logical ordering of precedence of rules. The rule banning certain classes of females from sexual approach is stronger than the rule authorizing sexual relations within marriage. Such a thing requires saying,

<sup>7</sup> Lévi 1929: 270 omitted it entirely.

<sup>8</sup> Chinese *zìjìngjiè* 自境界 is problematic, and may perhaps be based on a reading like \**svaviṣaya*, which nevertheless appears to yield no meaningful sense in this context.

<sup>9</sup> I believe that a sentence in the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* belongs to a different sort of discourse, although it appears to say something similar when it characterizes Vimalakīrti by saying (Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature 2006: 15 = §II.3) *bhāryāputradārāṃś ca saṃdarśayati sadā ca brahmacārī*.

<sup>10</sup> I owe thanks to Harunaga Isaacson for his kind, patient and convincing guidance on the proper interpretation of this passage.

perhaps, since it is not necessarily the case that restrictions on sexual relations are more stringent than restrictions on marriage.

Lists of forbidden women are found elsewhere in Indian Buddhist literature, but that in the *Daśākuśalakarmapatha* differs from those more well known. The list of four forbidden women in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, for instance, comprises the wife of another, one's mother, one's daughter, and maternal or paternal kinswomen, *catusprakāram agamyagamanarṇ kāma-mithyā-cārah | agamyāṇ gacchati paraparigrhītām vā mātaram duhitaram vā mātṛpitṛsambandhinīm vā*.<sup>11</sup> What appears to be an abbreviated reference to a similar list is found in the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, which states "Those with whom one should not have sexual relations are those referred to in the scriptures [with the expression] 'Among them, your mother et aliae, and one protected by your mother et aliae.'"<sup>12</sup> The *Yogācārabhūmi* passage in its turn is quoted (with attribution) by the 14<sup>th</sup> century Tibetan patriarch of the Gelukpa order Tsong kha pa in his classic work informally titled *Lam rim chen mo*.<sup>13</sup> Immediately afterwards, he quotes the versified text of the *Daśākuśalakarmapatha* in explanation of this sentence, as follows:<sup>14</sup>

bgrod par bya min zhes bya ni |  
 | gzhan bzung chos kyi rgyal mtshan ldan || rigs kyis bsrungs dang rgyal pos  
 bsrungs |  
 | gzhan gyis blangs pa'i smad 'tshong dang || nye du dag dang 'brel ba dang |  
 | de dag bgrod bya min pa yin |  
 | zhes gsungs pa ltar ro || gzhan gyis bzung ba ni gzhan gyi chung ma'o || chos kyi  
 rgyal mtshan can ni rab byung ma'o || rigs kyis bsrungs pa ni bag mar na [read: ma]  
 song ba rang gi pha la sogs pa'i gnyen nam gyos sgyug gam sgo bsrung ngam de  
 dag med na rang gis kyang bsrungs pa'o || rgyal po dang bskos pas bsrungs ba ni de  
 la chad pa'i khrims bcas pa'o || gzhan gyis gla gzhal ba'i smad [xylo: snad] 'tshong  
 la log g.yem du gsungs pas rang gis gla byin pa la log g.yem med par bstan to ||

"Those with whom you should not copulate"  
 Are those held by another, those having a religious insignia,  
 Those under the protection of family or king,  
 A prostitute who has been taken by another,

<sup>11</sup> *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* ad IV.74ab (Pradhan 1975: 244.14-15). The passage is translated in La Vallée Poussin 1923-1931: iv.157.

<sup>12</sup> T. 1579 (XXX) 631b13-14 (juan 59): 若於母等母等所護。如經廣說。名不應行; Derge Tanjur 4038, *sems tsam, zhi* 134b2-3: *de la ma la sogs pa dang | mas bsrungs pa la sogs pa mdo las ji skad gsungs pa rnam* ni 'jug par bya ba ma yin pa zhes bya'o.

<sup>13</sup> Tsong kha pa 1985: 166-167 = Bkra shis lhun po xylograph 100a4-5; the passage is translated in Cutler 2000: 220.

<sup>14</sup> Tsong kha pa 1985: 167 = Bkra shis lhun po 100a5-b2. The translation is that of Cutler 2000: 220.

And those related to you—

These are the ones with whom you should not copulate.

“Those held by another” are others’ wives. “Those who have a religious insignia” are renunciant women. “Those protected by family” are those who have not yet become brides and are protected by kinsfolk such as their fathers, who are protected by a father-in-law or mother-in-law, who are protected by a guard, or who—in the absence of these—are protected even by themselves. “Those protected by a king” or his representative are those concerning whom a punitive law has been laid down. The line stating that sex with a prostitute for whom another has paid is sexual misconduct shows that there is no sexual misconduct in hiring a prostitute oneself.

It is interesting that Tsong kha pa fails to quote the final, difficult line of the section, and that he explicitly accepts sexual relations with a prostitute, as long as the prostitute in question is not already engaged by another.<sup>15</sup>

As a point of comparison, non-Buddhist Indian works also refer to similar categories of restricted sexual partners. The *Āpastamba Dharmasūtra* lists prohibited women (using the term *asaṃyoga*) as follows:<sup>16</sup> siblings of one’s mother or father, or their children (*mātuḥ pitur iti yonisāṃbandhe sahāpatye strīgamanam*), a friend of one’s (female or male) elders—according to the commentary, of one’s mother or father, for instance—or another’s wife. For Gautama,<sup>17</sup> the list comprises an elder’s wife (the paradigmatic case, hence the expression for incest here and elsewhere, *gurutalpaga*), female friend, a sister, female relative, a pupil’s wife, or a daughter-in-law, and a cow. For Baudhāyana,<sup>18</sup> one is forbidden to have sexual contact with one’s father’s sister, maternal uncle’s sister, sister, sister’s daughter, daughter-in-law, maternal uncle’s wife or friend’s wife. Later and more developed legal works, belonging to the category of *smṛti* rather than *sūtra*, probably composed many hundreds of years after the *Dharmasūtras*, generally

<sup>15</sup> The passage has been commented upon recently by Geshe Lhundub Sopa 2005: 52. With regard to the last item, he says: “Prostitutes who are taken by another” means prostitutes or courtesans who are already obligated to or employed by someone who is paying them a fee. You could say that such a woman ‘belongs’ to that person, so it is improper to have sex with her. Stating it this way indicates that if you are paying the correct fee yourself, then it is not sexual misconduct to have relations with a prostitute.” Note that Sopa inexplicably renders the title of the root text “Explanation of the Ten Virtuous Paths of Action”—they are, of course, ‘non-virtuous,’ *akuśala*, *mi dge ba*.

<sup>16</sup> *Āpastamba* 1, *Prāśna* 1, *Paṭala* 7, *Khaṇḍa* 21 (8-9) in Bühler 1932, translation in Bühler 1897: 73-74, Olivelle 1999: 32.

<sup>17</sup> Gautama 23.12, edition Stenzler 1876, translation Bühler 1897: 284-285, Olivelle 1999: 117. See also *Vasiṣṭha* 20.16, and *Manu* XI.59, 171. An interesting contrast to Indian legal discussions of incest may be found by looking at Rabbinic debates, collected in considerable detail by Satlow 1995: 17-81.

<sup>18</sup> Baudhāyana 2.4.11, translation in Olivelle 1999: 177.

somewhat expand the list. For the *Viṣṇu-smṛti*, one must stay away from one's mother, daughter, daughter-in-law, an elder's wife, the wives of a paternal or maternal uncle, maternal grandfather, father-in-law, and the king, father or mother's sister, one's own sister, the wife of several different types of priests, of a friend, and others, including one who seeks protection, a female ascetic and a woman entrusted into one's care.<sup>19</sup> Turning to the matter of prostitutes, the *Nārada-smṛti* states that while sexual relations with a prostitute (here *veśyā*) are in principle permitted (that is, she is *gamyā*), the finable offence (*doṣa*) is the same as having relations with another's wife if the prostitute in question has been engaged already by another (*anyaparigrahā*).<sup>20</sup> The same idea is found in the *Yajñavalkya-smṛti*, which uses the term *avaruddha*, and in the *Arthaśāstra*, which uses the synonym *uparuddha*.<sup>21</sup>

When we compare these discussions with that in the *Daśākuśalakarmapatha*, we notice that like Gautama in this context, the *Daśākuśalakarmapatha* refers to a prohibition on bestiality,<sup>22</sup> and like some of the *smṛtis* it explicitly bans sexual contact with female renunciants. This Buddhist list, however, encompasses all (female) relatives in a single word, something which it may be able to do by assuming its audience's familiarity with, and acceptance of, more generalized societal restrictions, such as those specified in the law books. The attitude toward acceptable sexual relations with prostitutes likewise closely echoes that of the legal literature.

In sum, in the *Daśākuśalakarmapatha* we find an interesting, though perhaps still imperfectly understood, presentation of one Indian Buddhist sexual morality, one which turns out to have a great deal in common with non-Buddhist presentations. It is to be hoped that further materials may help clarify more completely the text's intention here, and allow us to discover if and how this intention was understood by later Buddhists, both in India and beyond.

<sup>19</sup> *Viṣṇu-smṛti* 34.1, 35.1, 36.4-7, translated in Jolly 1880. Compare *Yajñavalkya-smṛti* III.232-234, and *Nārada-smṛti* (text Lariviere 1989: 184, *Strīpumsayoga* 72a; translation 157), the latter of which also mentions one who has come for protection and a female ascetic.

<sup>20</sup> Text Lariviere 1989: 185, *Strīpumsayoga* 78; translation 158.

<sup>21</sup> *Yajñavalkya-smṛti* II.290; *Arthaśāstra* 3.20.15 (*rūpājīvām anyoparuddhām gacchataḥ*) in Kangle 1969: 127, with a translation in 1963: 292. The passage was studied by Sternbach 1951: 49-50 = 1965: 247-249. I thank Stephanie Jamison for bringing the *Arthaśāstra* passage to my attention; I then noticed the other relevant texts thanks to Sternbach's discussion.

<sup>22</sup> Buddhist monastic codes, in their discussions of activities prohibited to monks and nuns, often go into considerable detail not only on proscribed human sexual activities, but those one might perform with animals as well. These discussions, however, belong to a different discourse than that involved here. Note further that Indian legal texts other than *Gautama* also carry the same or similar proscriptions.

### *In memoriam*

As far as I know, the topic addressed here has no connections with Central Asian Buddhism, and only the most marginal with Yogācāra traditions, the two foci of Kōgi Kudara's researches. Nevertheless, I imagine that with his wry sense of humor and interest in the unusual, my old friend and first Sanskrit teacher would have enjoyed this small contribution, offered now with profound sadness not to him but, in reverence, to his memory.

### *References*

- Bühler, Georg. 1879. *The Sacred Law of the Āryas: As Taught in the Schools of Āpastamba, Gautama, Vāsistha, and Baudhāyana. Part 1: Āpastamba and Gautama*. The Sacred Books of the East 2 (Oxford: The Clarendon Press).
- . 1932. *Āpastamba's Aphorisms on The Sacred Laws of the Hindus*. Third edition. Bombay Sanskrit Series 44 and 50 (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute).
- Cordier, Palmyr. 1915. *Catalogue du Fonds Tibétain de la Bibliothèque Nationale*. Part 3 (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale).
- Cutler, Joshua W. C. 2000. *The Great Treatise on the Stages of the Path to Enlightenment, by Tsong-kha-pa*. Volume 1 (Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion Publications).
- Jolly, Julius. 1880. *The Insitutes of Vishnu*. The Sacred Books of the East 7 (Oxford: The Clarendon Press. Reprinted: Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1965).
- Kangle, R. P. 1963. *The Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra. Part II: An English translation with critical and explanatory notes*. University of Bombay Studies: Sanskrit, Prakrit and Pali 2 (Bombay: University of Bombay).
- . 1969. *The Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra. Part I: A critical edition with a glossary*. Second edition (Bombay: University of Bombay; reprint: Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1986).
- Lariviere, Richard W. 1989. *The Nāradaśmṛti: Critically edited with an introduction, annotated translation, and appendices*. University of Pennsylvania Studies on South Asia 4 (Philadelphia: Department of South Asia Regional Studies, University of Pennsylvania). 2 vols.
- La Vallée Poussin, Louis de. 1923-1931. *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu* (Paris: Geuthner; Reprint Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques 16, Bruxelles: Institut Belge des hautes Études Chinoises, 1971).
- Lévi, Sylvain. 1929. "Autour d'Aśvaghoṣa." *Journal Asiatique* 215/2: 255-285.
- Mochizuki Kaie 望月海慧 and Kanno Ryūshō 管野龍清. 1996. "Memyō ni kisareru Jūfuzengōdō sesshi no kenkyū" 馬鳴に帰される『十不善業道説示』の研究 [Aśvaghoṣa's *Daśākuśalakarmapathanirdeśa*]. *Bukkyōgaku Ronshū* 佛教學論集 20: 1-24.
- Olivelle, Patrick. 1999. *Dharmasūtras: The Law Codes of Āpastambha, Gautama, Baudhāyana and Vasiṣṭha* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Pradhan, Prahlad. 1975. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 8 (Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute).



- Satlow, Michael L. 1995. *Tasting the Dish: Rabbinic Rhetorics of Sexuality*. Brown Judaic Studies 303 (Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- Sherburne, Richard. 2000. *The Complete Works of Atīśa Śrī Dīpaṅkara Jñāna, Jo-bo-rje. The Lamp for the Path and Commentary, together with the newly translated Twenty-five Key Texts. (Tibetan and English Texts)* (New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan).
- Sopa, Geshe Lhundub, with David Pratt. 2005. *Steps on the Path to Enlightenment: A Commentary on Tsongkhapa's Lamrim Chenmo*. Volume 2: Karma (Boston: Wisdom Publications).
- Stenzler, Adolph Friedrich. 1876. *The Institutes of Gautama* (London: Trübner & Co.).
- Sternbach, Ludwig. 1951. "Legal Position of Prostitutes According to Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 71/1: 25-60.
- . 1965. *Juridical Studies in Ancient Indian Law*. Part I (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass).
- Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature. 2006. *Bonbun Yuimakyō: Potarakyū shozō shahon ni motozuku kōtei 梵文維摩經—ポタラ宮所蔵写本に基づく校訂 / Vimalakīrtinirdeśa: A Sanskrit Edition based upon the Manuscript Newly Found at the Potala Palace* (Tokyo: Taisho University Press).
- Tsong kha pa. 1985. *Byang chub lam rim che ba* (Xining: Qinghai Minzu Chubanshe 青海民族出版社).

**Aspects of Research into  
Central Asian Buddhism**

**In memoriam Kōgi Kudara**

Edited by  
Peter Zieme

© 2008, Brepols Publishers n.v., Turnhout, Belgium.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

D/2008/0095/23

ISBN 978-2-503-52751-2

Printed in the E.U. on acid-free paper