

The Buddhist Robe according to the Teaching

—*Nyohōe, Nōe and Funzōe*—

Diane Riggs

The concept of the “robe according to the teaching” (*nyohōe* 如法衣) has historically been the foundation of kesa reform movements in Japanese Buddhism that were particularly strong during the Edo period (1603–1867). The term *nyohōe* is widely used by contemporary Japanese robe sewing groups as well as by western Zen groups but the origin, meaning and implications of the term are little understood. The term is frequently understood to apply exclusively to the form of the robe taught by promoters of contemporary kesa sewing practice. In fact, however, the term *nyohōe* points to a highly developed and nuanced accommodation of the Buddhist teachings to the practical and physical demands of various countries. The term is found in the first systematization of monastic rules, which was in itself a tremendous achievement of cultural accommodation. Even at this time, three major patterns of the Buddhist approach towards robes had emerged: the ascetic, the monastic, and the glorification of the Buddha.

This is a report of research undertaken while I was visiting Ryukoku University under the auspices of a Numata fellowship from April 1st of 2006 to March 31st of 2007. I wish to express my gratitude to Ryukoku University International Center, and the Numata Foundation for their generous support.

I. The concept of *Nyohōe*

Nyohō (如法) means “in accord with the Buddhist law”, or “what the Buddha taught” in early Buddhist texts (*Chūagon kyō* 中阿含經, *Taisho* v.1, 667. 1-2). In historical as well as contemporary usage, *nyohō* refers to ethical and religious teachings as well as rules governing material aspects of the monks lives. But texts do not completely control the definition of what is according to the teaching. In addition to textual sources there is a flexible range of authorities that define this concept for each particular age and cultural setting. In Japanese Buddhism the term was appropriated by the Shingon monastic teachings school (Shingon risshū 真言律宗) and by the Zen school to refer to ideals, rules and customs specific to that school¹⁾. The authority for determining what is *nyohō* may derive from the prescriptions of monastic rules texts (*vinaya*) in Indian and Chinese Buddhism or from the prescriptions of Zen monastic rules texts

(Jpn: *shingi* 清規) in Chan and Zen schools. In practice, however, customs passed on from master to disciple have considerable authority in determining what is according to the teaching. *Nyohō* is thus a complex term that is shaped by textual and oral traditions and governs immaterial and material aspects of monastic life.

The compound term, *nyohō e* (如法衣), or “robe according to the teaching” addresses the problem of how the immaterial teaching manifests in the material form of the robe. The kind of clothing deemed “according to the teaching” is often prescribed by nontextual oral teachings and customs passed on at training temples²⁾. In contemporary Japanese Buddhism the physical characteristics of garments designated as *nyohōe* vary according to the perspective of the speaker. A Buddhist scholar or teacher is likely to rely on textual sources and the forms that developed in Japan within the “*risshū*” or *vinaya* subsets of the Shingon and Jōdo schools. On the other hand, ordained and lay Sōto Zen believers who sew robes as a religious practice learn forms established by Sawaki Kōdō (1880–1965) and Hashimoto Ekō (1890–1965) in twentieth century Sōtō Zen *kesa* sewing groups, using manuals and direct, hands-on teaching from the disciples of these teachers. Finally, commercial robe makers have begun to market garments that they define as *nyohōe*, adapting forms of Shingon and Sōtō Zen robes to meet commercial needs³⁾.

For all their variety, each of these groups relies directly or indirectly on the *vinaya*, a body of Buddhist literature that explains the rules of monastic life and the precedents that gave rise to the rule. Although some parts of the *vinaya*, like the *Prātimokṣa*, are quite ancient, the large collections of monastic codes were written down centuries after the Buddha’s lifetime⁴⁾. As a result, the details of practical living that describe the robes and how to treat them portray the state of the Buddhist order at the time of the writing, not at the time of the Buddha. There are six extant *vinaya*, one in Pāli, and five translated into Chinese from Sanskrit. The literary structure of the *vinaya* frames the text within the life of the Buddha, so each rule is presented as a response to a situation encountered by the Buddha and his disciples during his long life as a teacher. For East Asian Buddhists, the most important of these *vinaya* texts is the *Four Part Vinaya* (*Shibunritsu* 四分律, *Taishō* v.22, #1428–1431), the *vinaya* of the Dharmaguptaka school, the *vinaya* most extensively studied by the Chinese *Vinaya* Master, Daoxuan (道宣 596–667) and transmitted to Japan by one of his students, Jianzhen (Ganjin 鑑真 688–763)⁵⁾. Japanese Buddhists also studied the *Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya* (根本説一切有部毘奈耶, *Taishō* v.23, #1442–1445), translated by Daoxuan’s contemporary, Yijing (Gijō 義淨 635–713). Yijing, having travelled to India himself, was critical of Daoxuan’s explanation of certain key points in regard to the robe. During the Edo period, as *vinaya* studies among scholar monks became more extensive in Japan, these points of contention were debated, and all five Chinese *vinaya* were regularly cited as authoritative⁶⁾. As a result, contemporary students of *kesa* in Japan have a considerable range of materials to draw on, some of it contradictory.

To the extent that the term *nyohōe* is tied to a specific physical form of the robe it is polemical. That is, if some forms are according to the Buddha's teaching then other forms are not and can be declared to be outside of the teaching⁷⁾. Clothing rules and the language used to describe the essentials of color, fabric and measure are so sensitive to time, place, climate and social conditions that it can be quite challenging to understand exactly what is meant by the rule. When Buddhist culture travelled to the different climate and culture of China, adaptations of these garments were naturally vulnerable to being labelled as not according to the original rules of the *vinaya*. To a certain degree, the modern robe sewing movement idealizes a form of the robe that predates Chinese adaptations, without, however, being willing to give up these modifications entirely. This yearning to return to the robe that the Buddha wore, however, obscures the fact that the *vinaya* texts are describing situations and physical circumstances that were probably quite different from those predominant during the Buddha's lifetime. During the five hundred years after the Buddha's death, his followers were already dealing with the first fundamental adaptation of the robe that was propelled by a shift away from the earlier lifestyle of wandering ascetics to a settled monastic life.

II. Three Paradigms of the Buddhist Robe

The *vinaya* prescriptions about the robe testify to the tension between the ascetic and monastic lifestyles and demonstrate how Buddhists negotiated changes in the robe, the most public and material expression of the Buddhist teaching. Instead of treating these two patterns as competing, both were given the imprimatur of having originated with the Buddha. Thus, a robe according to the dharma in its most basic sense is not one particular physical form but is created out of a Buddhist ethos of clothing. This ethos is most clearly represented by the two stories about the origin of the Buddhist robe: the rag robe and the monastic robe. The story of the genesis of the rag robe addresses the question, "what is the minimum physical requirement to sustain practice"? The story of the monastic robe, on the other hand, addresses the question, "what is the relationship between the Buddhist monk and the wider society"? These two origin stories would appear to cover the widest range of possible combinations. But there is yet another important paradigm of the robe brought up in very early Buddhist literature: the case of the golden robe. Rather than appearing as an origin story and a departure point for establishing rules for Buddhist practice, the golden robe is a conundrum for practitioners. Instead of addressing the concerns of monastic or ascetic life, the golden robe asks the question, "what is the Buddha"? Although the *vinaya* does not present the golden robe as a practice to be emulated, the ambiguous interpretations of the meaning of this robe provided opportunities for East Asian Buddhists. As a myth supporting the lineage of teachers extending back to the time of the Buddha the golden robe had considerable impact on East Asian Buddhists and to some

degree is responsible for the nearly ubiquitous practice of wearing gold brocade robes in Japanese Buddhism.

The pattern of the rag robe explains that the Buddhist robe originated with the practice of making robes from cloth discarded by the laity at gravesites and roadsides. This cloth could no longer be used by the laity because it was considered polluted either by association with death and bodily processes or by having been used in rituals. The Buddhists claim that the cloth was rendered pure by the Buddha's followers who washed, dyed and stitched them together into robes which they wore as part of their ascetic lifestyle⁸⁾. When the robe was made following these precise prescriptions (washing, dyeing and stitching together) it was deemed pure and, accordingly, *nyohōe* by conforming to the rule for rag robes. Here, purity refers not to whether the cloth was clean, but whether it had undergone the prescribed procedure. Although subsisting on the leavings of others, the pattern of the rag robe origin conveys a image of wandering ascetics who have little direct contact with the laity.

The practice of wearing the rag robe is idealized in vinaya literature as one of the four supports of practice (Skt: *niśraya*; Jpn: *e* 依) which include wearing rag robes, taking frugal meals, residing under a tree, and using only medications made from cow urine⁹⁾. Wearing rag robes also appears as one of the twelve (or thirteen) ascetic practices (Skt: *dhūtaguṇa*) that defined the lives of forest dwellers (Skt: *āraṇṇika*). The *vinaya* list ten kinds of fabric that are suitable for the rag robe indicating the ways in which the fabric has been used and why it was discarded. Fabrics suitable for the rag robe have been:

1. chewed by cows
2. chewed by rodents
3. burnt
4. used for menstruation
5. used in childbirth
6. used for ceremonies in a shrine, then naturally carried away from the shrine by birds, animals or the wind.
7. used in burial ceremonies
8. used for petitionary rites to the gods
9. discarded when receiving employment from the king (e.g., discarding the old uniform on a promotion)
10. used to wrap a corpse (*T.* v.22. # 1428, 850a).

This list reflects the multiple meanings of the word, *pāṃsu*. Monier-Williams offers the following meanings for the Sanskrit word, *pāṃsu*: 1. dust-heap; 2. a collection of rags out of a dust-heap used by Buddhist monks for their clothing and one who wears such robes; 3. crumbling soil, dust, sand; 4. dung or manure (known only through lexicons); 5. menses. The Chinese characters used to form a transliteration of the Sanskrit word mean literally, "dung wiping (cloth)", or *funzō* 糞掃. But "manure" is only one of several meanings and although this choice of Chinese character was probably the least appropriate semantically, it delivered the proper phonetic value and a hint of the meaning of the original Sanskrit word¹⁰⁾. The Chinese transliteration of *pāṃsukūla* has considerable shock value for East Asian Buddhists. Another aspect of the *vinaya* prescription is its careful specificity and its focus on cloth that is not dirty in the ordinary sense, but is ritually impure. For example, four of the ten types of

fabric (numbers six to nine above) indicate not soiled cloth but cloth used in sacred or secular rituals that cannot be returned to ordinary uses.

Although there is evidence in the *vinaya* that the forest dwellers themselves were regarded with ambivalence by settled monastic communities, the ascetic ideal itself was revered. For example, the rag robe asceticism of Mahākāśyapa portrayed by the early Buddhist texts made him an ideal figure to lend credence to the claims of the authenticity of Mahāyāna (Silk 2003). The iconic power of the rag robe (if not the actual practice) was utilized by East Asian Buddhists who often depicted Buddha's disciples and even the founders of East Asian teaching lineages wearing rag robes.

A second pattern explains the origin of the robe as a request from King Bimbisāra who complained to the Buddha that his disciples should wear distinctive clothing so one could easily identify them from the followers of other teachers. Later, when the Buddha was travelling with his disciples, he looked out over the ripening fields and charged Ānanda with the task of making a robe that reflected the pattern of field and furrow. Ānanda then cut fabric into pieces and sewed these pieces into panels with seams on each side representing the divisions between the fertile portions of the field. The Buddha praised Ānanda's design, saying "this cut and sewn robe is made in accord with the teaching (*T. v.23, #1435, 194c12-195a1*)"¹¹). The story makes the point that the creation of a distinctive style of clothing for the Buddhist monk was motivated by recognition of the legitimate needs of the lay supporters of Buddhism, as well as the need to be responsive to secular authorities in the matter of dress. The Buddha responds to the King's request by suggesting a general model for the design, but it is the disciple whose task it is to implement these vague indications, creating the actual dimensions and design of a garment and submitting it to the Buddha for approval. The original impetus, design and implementation of a distinctive robe was a cooperative project involving lay supporter, Buddha and the disciples that involved accountability to the laity and delegation of responsibility. The design, which resembles fertile fields is a clear reference to the metaphor of the monk as a field of merit. In this metaphor, donations given to the worthy monk will produce spiritual nourishment just as planting and tending the fields produces physical nourishment. This origin story of the Buddhist robe validates the interdependence of monks and lay supporters, providing the authority for what some have called one of the most ancient and enduring rituals of the Buddhist faith still practiced in Southeast Asian Buddhism: the annual donation of cloth after the rainy season retreat called the *kaṭhina* rite¹²).

These two origin stories of the Buddhist robe represent two different approaches to the Buddha's teaching: one that views Buddhism as a religion of ascetic seekers and the other that understands Buddhism as a monastic in symbiotic relationship with the laity. It appears that for contemporary believers the question of which is more antique and by corollary, more authentic, is secondary to the fact that the *vinaya* depicts both patterns as initiated by the Buddha¹³). In robe sewing groups both types of origin stories

are revered and used in different contexts to promote faith and respect for the Buddhist robe.

In great contrast to these two traditions of a modest or even poor appearance, early Buddhist texts also record the story of a robe of golden thread (or wool) woven for the Buddha by his aunt and foster mother, Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī. Some accounts say the Buddha refused this garment, asking that she give it to the order of monks. When the monks in turn refused to accept the golden kesa it was decided that the garment should be kept in trust for the future Buddha, Maitreya.¹⁴⁾ Other accounts say that the Buddha accepted the garment, using it to preach the esoteric doctrines (myōhō 妙法). Finally, Xuanzang's account in his record of his visit to India, *Da Tang Xi ji* (Daitō saiiki ki 大唐西域記) states that when his life drew to a close, the Buddha bestowed a golden thread kesa on his disciple Mahākāśyapa as a recognition of his understanding, to be kept in trust to be passed on to the future Buddha, Maitreya¹⁵⁾. This version of the story is used in the Chan school in the *Jing de zhuan deng lu* (Keitoku dentō roku 景德傳燈錄)¹⁶⁾. In this account, the ancient story of the kesa woven with golden threads to be held in trust for Maitreya became fused with the Chan school's account of their lineage. Previously restricted to the Buddhas, the Chan school reinterpreted the golden robe as the mark of transmission in their lineage of living teachers. Not all were convinced, however, and the question of whether the Buddha's gift of a robe to Mahākāśyapa was a golden robe or his own rag robe was disputed during the Edo period in the midst of a widening acceptance of the use of gold brocade robes.

These are the three major patterns of belief and practice regarding the Buddhist robe that appear in ancient texts: the robe made from scraps of discarded cloth as an integral part of ascetic life; the robe made of materials donated to the community of monks that signals the interdependence of lay and monastic groups; and finally the golden robe associated with Buddhahood. Although these three paradigms arise from very different circumstances and questions about what it means to be a Buddhist, they are by no means mutually exclusive. Throughout history there has been considerable borrowing between these three patterns creating, for example, patchwork robes made of gold brocade scraps. The potential for extreme polarization between the two ideals of asceticism and monasticism was tempered by alternative methods of defining *nyohōe*. We now turn to definitions of *nyohōe* that applied equally to the rag robe and the monastic robe: the three humilities (sansen 三賤) and the ambiguous term "pieced robe" (*nōe* 衲衣/納衣).

III. Negotiating between the three Paradigms

The ethical value of wearing clothing that does not distract the monk from his practice nor attract unsuitable attention from the laity is expressed in the vinaya as the "three humilities"¹⁷⁾. Because it addresses the relationship between the monk and the society in which he lives, it properly belongs to the monastic sphere. Each of the three

humilities, however, expresses a physical quality typical of robes made from rags, and thus allow monastic robes made of new cloth to more closely resemble the rag robe. First, the humility of the knife (tōsen 刀賤) requires the expanse of uncut new cloth to be cut into small pieces before being made into robes. This destroys the worldly value of the cloth, making it unsuitable for the laity. Second, the humility of the robe (esen 衣賤), requires the surface of the cloth to be stitched, literally, pierced (sasu 刺す) throughout. This destroys its softness and flexibility, making it rough. These first two qualities are sometimes referred to as pieced and stitched (*shinō* 刺衲) robes. Finally, the humility of color (*shikisen* 色賤) requires that the cloth should be dyed, producing an indeterminate or “broken” color (*ejiki* 壞色). The five “primary” colors (*shōshiki* 正色) of red, yellow, blue, white or black must particularly be avoided. By destroying the attractive qualities of the new cloth, monastic robes come to resemble rag robes, i. e., small bits of cloth dyed to a uniform muddy color and sewn together into rough robes, keeping the monk’s mind focused on Buddhist practice and preventing envy from arising in the minds of lay people (*T.* v. 24 #1462, 717.1). The three humilities indicate the ideal of a modest and low-key appearance, a middle way between the excesses of the laity and the extreme practice of the naked ascetics¹⁸). By expressing these values, the vinaya provides three criteria for *nyohō e* that can be applied equally well to rag robes or to monastic robes.

The term “pieced robe” used to translate Sanskrit word, *kanthā*, which means a patchwork garment establishes a middle ground between the rag robe and the monastic garment¹⁹). *Nōe* is defined as a robe made of scraps, either old soiled cloth, or donated cloth that is too small to make a full robe. Some sources equate the two terms *nōe* and *funzōe*, but other sources argue that as these two terms derive from different Sanskrit terms they must be kept distinct²⁰). As we have seen, the list of ten fabrics which define rag robes are closely tied to the word “pāṃsukūla”, and these highly specific prescriptions are focused on the provenience of the used cloth. The pieced robe (*nōe*), on the other hand, is used more loosely to refer to monk’s attire, whether originally made from new, donated cloth that has been cut and sewn, or sewn together from used cloth. The absence of specific rules about the origin of the cloth show that the term pieced robe indicated a broader range of allowable materials than that for the rag robe.

Stories in the vinaya describing the origin of the pieced robe indicate how this term bridges the difference between the rag robe and the monastic robe. In one story, a monk has received a piece of cloth that is too small to make a full robe and he receives permission to make a pieced robe. This sets a precedent for smaller pieces of donated fabric to be pieced together to make one robe. Permission to make “five pieced robe” (*gonōe* 五衲衣), or multi-colored pieced robe was requested by Śāriputra, who had received scraps of cloth in bright, clear colors²¹). One of the requirements for the rag robe is that discarded cloth gathered by the practitioner must first be washed, then dyed before being sewn into a robe, and that bright pure colors must be avoided. But

here no mention is made of dyeing the cloth to break down the color, implying that permission was granted to use the cloth as is, and therefore this precedent allows brightly colored bits of rags to be sewn into robes.

We can see the effect of this precedent in Chinese depictions of pieced robes in the caves of Dunhaung. Typically, Mahākāśyapa, revered as the foremost disciple in ascetic practices is depicted wearing robes with patches of distinct colors of green, brown, purple, reddish brown and other colors, but there are also paintings of Śākya-muni and Kṣitigarbha (Jizō 地藏) wearing such robes (Matsumura, 1998). The Chinese also produced such multi-color pieced robes, even imitating the pattern of patchwork in their weaving techniques. The pieced robe kesa in the ancient collections of Shōsōin (正倉院) and Hōryūji (法隆寺) are of this type, showing a distinct variation in the colors of the patches which, rather than being dyed to a uniform color are left intact. These artistic depictions and textiles testify to the tremendous impact of the multi-colored pieced robe on the mental conception of the robe in East Asian Buddhism, and the relatively unrecorded practice of washing, dyeing and sewing rags into robes. It is not clear whether the Chinese ever adopted this practice, but judging from the evidence of paintings, sculpture and textiles, it is likely that their idea of the patchwork robe of the Buddha conformed to this precedent of the mutli-colored pieced robe.

One could argue that the multi-colored pieced robe offers a better visual image of the patchwork robe, but the naming conventions for these textiles suggest that the Chinese were sensitive to the distinction between rag robes and pieced robes. The terms *nōe* or *nōgesa* (衲衣/衲袈裟) were commonly used to refer to the kesa in the Shōsōin, Hōryūji and other similar textiles brought from China rather than using the highly specialized term, *funzōe*. Another term used frequently is *shinō* (刺衲), which combines the pieced robe with the value of the humility of the robe, identifying the method of covering the surface of the robe with a running stitch to make it rough, and demonstrating the value of the “humility of the robe”. This aspect was nearly as important as the appearance of multi-colored patches, and the representation of such running stitches can be seen in artistic works from the caves of Dunhuang to medieval Japanese portraits of famous monks. The broader application and use of the term pieced robe (*nōe* 衲衣), is also seen in the metonymic use of the character “nō” 衲 in East Asian Buddhism used in writing as humble convention to refer to oneself or in combination with other characters to create a general category indicating monks (i.e. those who wear the pieced robe). The term for rag robes, *funzōe*, did not produce such linguistic offshoots.

Conclusion

The normal term for pieced robes since earliest times was *nōe*, as can be seen, for example, in the catalogues of treasures of the Hōryūji and Shōsōin. Some modern scholars, however, have begun to refer to these kesa using the term *funzōe*, as if the

two terms were equivalent. It is may well be that this practice begins during the Edo period, when exhibits of temple treasures (kaichō 開帳) made these textiles available to the public for the first time (Kiuchi 1978, 5). In an effort to increase the spiritual cache of the ancient garments, exhibitors may have chosen to use the term *funzōe*²²⁾. But these robes are obviously made with great skill and use pieces of fine quality cloth, so even in their current damaged state they do not appear to made from humble rags. Some scholars argue that in China the rag robe was aestheticized, and so such textiles become an example of the gradual degeneration of Buddhist practice and teaching²³⁾.

This conflation of the *nōe* and the *funzōe*, however, obscures the possibility of understanding the multi-colored pieced robe on its own terms, that is, as one of the methods of making robes requested by Śāriputra and approved by the Buddha. As such, the pieced robe of bright colors is according to the Buddha's teaching: it is *nyohōe*. This relatively recent tendency obscures the distinctions between the three paradigms of Buddhist robes. It is a common critique among scholars and believers alike that robes pieced out of brightly colored silks have abandoned the pure practice of the original rag robes of the Buddha. As we have seen, however, *nyohō e* is already a highly negotiated concept even in the vinaya texts, where it encompasses numerous contradictions under the single overarching authority of the Buddha's approval. It is this accomodating and yet precise articulation of differences that gives the Buddhist robe its vitality as one of the Buddha's great teachings.

Notes

- 1) *Bukkyogo daijiten* (1063.1) defines *nyohō* as 1. the correct way (Skt: dharmatā); 2. according to what the Buddha taught (Pali: yathādharmam); 3. having a true meaning (Pali: saha dhammena); 4. good things 5. Rules and customs of the Zen sect.
- 2) In the cas of robe practices in Sōtō Zen the authority of one's teacher often was valued above any text or rule established by the sect. For a good example of this, see Kawaguchi's study of the extent of compliance to rules established by the Sōtō Zen sect in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century: Kawaguchi Kōfū 川口高風, "Meiji, Taishō ki ni okeru Sōtō shū no tō gesa hō 明治. 大正期における宗洞宗の塔袈裟法". (*Journal of Sōtō Zen Studies* 43, 2001): 233-238.
- 3) The following websites of commercial robe makers offer *nyohō e*. Some of the websites also define what the term means:
<http://www.suzukihouiten.jp/knowledge>
<http://www.kinranya.com/user/>
<http://www.rak2.jp/town/user/rakuya/>
- 4) The six extant Sanskrit vinaya texts are based on the ancient ritual text of the Pratimokṣa, that some scholars believe dates to approximately 500 BC. The five vinaya that were translated into Chinese are: Sarvāstivādin, Dharmaguptaka, Mahīśāsaka, Mahāsaṃghika and Mūlasarvāstivādin. See Nakamura 1980, 50-56.
- 5) In addition to his commentaries on the Dharmagupta vinaya, some of Daoxuan's more controversial writings about the Buddhist robe are contained in the *Risshū kantsū den* 『律宗感通伝』 (*Taisho* v.45 #1898); and the *Shakumon shōfuku gi* 『釋門章服儀』 (*Taisho* v. 45, #1894).
- 6) There are a number of Japanese studies of the Buddhist robe as portrayed in the vinaya literature. Sato (1963) provides the most readable and thorough comparison of all six extant vinaya on this topic. Abe (1985, 2001) discusses the robe as an ascetic practice in early

The Buddhist Robe according to the Teaching

- Buddhism and in Dōgen's fascicles. Tsuna (1961) writes about the kesa more broadly, including explanations of Japanese practices with his discussion of the Indian vinaya. Horiuchi (1983) discusses the concept of *nyohōe*.
- 7) The term *gedō* (外道), literally, "outside teachings" could be translated as "heretical". Vinaya texts portray the Buddha as having declared nakedness as well as various kinds of clothing heretical only in the sense that these practices belong to the followers of other sects. For a comparison of Jain and Buddhist attitudes towards clothing, see Abe, 1985.
 - 8) For an analysis of early Buddhist practices, including that of removing cloth from graveyards, see: DeCaroli, Robert. *Haunting the Buddha*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
 - 9) Other lists of "four supports" address mental aspects of Buddhist teachings. See Nakamura 2002, 410b: "shie"; *Bukkyo go daijiten* "shie" p.508. See also Prebish 1974, 4.
 - 10) See "pāṃsu" in Monier-Williams 1899, 613.3.
 - 11) The story of the Buddha looking out over the fields and approving of the design for robes also occurs in the Mahāsaṃghika-vinaya. In this version of the story, however, the Buddha explains to the monks that all the Buddhas of the past knew the right way for robes was like this field pattern and that all robes from now on should be made in this way. T.22, #1425, 454c27-455a1.
 - 12) Holt, 1995, 134-136. An composite picture of the kaṭhina rite drawn from different sources is provided by Chang Kun. *A Comparative Study of the Kaṭhinavastu*, Indo-Iranian monographs, v.1. 's-Gravenhage: Mouton, 1957. The kaṭhina rite has not been a feature of Japanese Buddhism, but has recently been performed by a Thai Buddhist organization location in Osaka, Japan. Although most of the participants are Thai immigrants, a number of Japanese also attend the ceremony.
 - 13) For a brief analysis of the evidence of the earlier precedent of rag robes, see Abe 2001.
 - 14) In some texts, Ananda is asked to present the robe to the future Maitreya who, having received the robe subsequently receives his prediction of future Buddhahood. See: *Dama-mūka (nidānasūtra)* (Kengukyō 賢愚經) T. no.202, vol.4, p.434a; *Zabao zang jing (Zōbō zōkyō 雜寶藏經)* T. no.203, vol.4, *Madhyamāgama sūtra (Chū agon kyō 中阿含經)* T. no.26, vol.1, p.511b. For a full list of the variant stories, see: Mochizuki 1933-36, v.1:545.
 - 15) T. no.2087, vol.50, p.902a.
 - 16) T. no.2076, vol.51, 364b. Gold brocade transmission robes began to appear in Japan during the Kamakura period. These textiles will be discussed in the next chapter.
 - 17) See "sansen" 三賤 in *Zen gaku daijiten*, 402.
 - 18) The Buddha is depicted in Pāli and Sanskrit literature as having emphatically prescribed the use of robes in order to distinguish his own followers from those of other teachers. The garments are promoted as an example of the Buddha's teaching of "few wants, knowledge of sufficiency" (shōyokuchisoku 小欲知足) and as a middle way between the excesses of the laity who collect vast amounts of their white garments, and the naked ascetics who wear no garments at all (Da zhi du lun (大智度論) (T.25, #1509, f.68 see Mochizuki 1456).
 - 19) See Monier-Williams, "kanthā" 249.2; "pāṃsu-kūla", 613.3. Chapter four of the Lotus Sūtra translates the term "kanthā" as nōe 衲衣. See also the English translation of the Sanskrit version of the Lotus Sūtra in Hurvitz 1976, 358.
 - 20) Mochizuki (4165) cites the following sources that accept nōe as an alternative name for funzōe: Sūtra of the Twelve austerities (Jūni zudakyō 十二頭陀經); the Ten Recitations vinaya (Jūjuritsu f.39) and the eighth century Sanskrit-Chinese dictionary, Erin ongi 璣音義 f.11. Sources that distinguish the two terms include the Mahāsaṃghika-vinaya (Makasōgiritsu 摩訶僧祇律 T.22 #1425, 292b) which differentiates the two terms in a list of the types of robes; the Treatise of the Path of Liberation (Gedatsu dōron 解脫道論) f.2 on the 12 ascetic practices; and the Daijōgishō 大乘義章, a dictionary of Buddhist terminology compiled by Hui-yuan (Eon 慧遠) in the fourth century. See also: *Zengaku daijiten*, 1006b; *Bukkyō go daijiten*, 1084b and *Bukkyō jiten*, 812b).
 - 21) The Chinese text uses the word "get" and does not mention a donor.
 - 22) My current research project is focused on how the popularization of the term *funzōe* is

The Buddhist Robe according to the Teaching

most likely tied to Edo period exhibitions of the so-called seven treasures of Shotoku Taishi, in which the first item of these seven treasures was the Hōryūji pieced robe, relabelled as a *funzōe* (Kiuchi 1978, 5).

- 23) Such critiques can be seen in art books. Also see Matsumura, 1998 and for an English language account, Lyman, 1984.

Abbreviation

T. *Taishō shinshū Daizōkyō*.

Bibliography

- Abe Jion. "Funzōe kō". *Tōhō* (Tōhō gakuin) 1, 1985.
- . *Zuda no kenkyū* (Research on (Buddhist) Asceticism). Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 2001.
- Chang Kun. *A Comparative Study of the Kaṭhinavastu*, Indo-Iranian monographs, v.1. 's-Gravenhage: Mouton, 1957.
- Holt, John C. *Discipline: The Canonical Buddhism of the Vinayapiṭaka*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1991.
- Horiuchi Kanjin. *Shingonshū hōe hōgu kaisetsu* (Explanation of vestments and ritual implements of the Shingon sect) Osaka: Seieisha, 1983.
- Kawaguchi Kōfū. "Meiji, Taishō ki ni okeru Sōtō shū no tō gesa hō (The Manner of Wearing the Kesa in th Sōtō lineage during the Meiji and Taishō eras)". *Journal of Sōtō Zen Studies* 43 (2001): 233-238.
- Kiuchi Takeo. "Hōryūji ken'nō hōmotsu "funzōe" ni tsuite". *Museum: Tokyo kokuritsu hakubutsu kan bijutsu shi* 332, no.11 (1978): 4-14.
- Lyman, Marie. "Distant Mountains: The Influence of Funzō-e on the Tradition of Buddhist Clerical Robes in Japan". *Textile Museum Journal* 23 (1984): 26-41.
- Matsumura Kaoruko. "Funzōe no kenkyū". In *Bunka ronshū*, 12-50, 1998.
- Mochizuki Shinkō. *Bukkyō dai jiten*. Tokyo: Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai, 1933-36.
- Monier-Williams. *A Sanskrit-English dictionary: etymologically and philologically arranged with special reference to cognate Indo-European languages*. Oxford: Clarendon press, 1899.
- Nakamura Hajime. *Indian Buddhism: A Survey with Bibliographic Notes*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1980.
- . *Bukkyō go daijiten*. Tokyo: Tokyo Shoseki, 1981.
- , ed. *Bukkyō jiten*, second ed. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2002 [1989].
- Prebish, Charles S. *Buddhist Monastic Discipline*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1974.
- Satō Mitsuo. *Genshi Bukkyō kyōdan no kenkyū* (A Study of the Early Buddhist Order in the Vinaya Piṭaka). Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin, 1993 (1963).
- Takakuso Junjirō, and Watanabe Kaikoku et al., eds. *Taishō shinshū Daizōkyō*. 100 vols. Tokyo: Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō Kankōkai, 1924-1934.
- Tsuna Seiryū. "Hōe ni tsui te". *Chizan gaku* 9 (1961): 1-31.