

1272818 0 Trimmed page size: 216x138mm (Defined by small dashed line)

Magenta guides show margin positions as: Head = 17mm

Back = 17mm

Page 1 job: 1272818

Pali Text Society

Overcoming Doubts (Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī)

Vol. I

THE BHIKKHU-PĀTIMOKKHA
COMMENTARY

TRANSLATED BY

K.R. Norman, Petra Kieffer-Pülz,
and William Pruitt

Published by

The Pali Text Society
Bristol
2018

First published 2018

© Pali Text Society 2018

ISBN-13 978 0 86013 517 3

Published by the Pali Text Society
c/o CPI Antony Rowe – Melksham
Unit 4 Pegasus Way
Bowerhill Industrial Estate
Melksham, Wilts
SN12 6TR, U.K

www.palitext.com

Printed and bound by CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY

CONTENTS

Contents	v
Preface	xiii
Translators' Introduction	
1. Text	xv
2. Author	xvi
3. Date	xxii
4. Title	xxviii
5. Sources	xxviii
6. Arrangement of the text and parallels in Sp	xxxii
7. Names of chapters (<i>vagga</i>)	
7.1 Nissaggiya-Pācittiya	xxxiv
7.2 Pācittiya	xxxv
7.3 Sekhiya	xxxv
8. Names of the rules	
8.1. Supposed divergences between the names of the rules in Kkh and Sp	xxxvii
8.2. Some divergences between the names of the rules in Kkh and Sp	xxxviii
8.2.1. Sgh 9 M	xxxviii
8.2.2. Niss 4 M	xxxix
8.2.3. Niss 29 M	xl
8.2.4. Pāc 20 M	xl
8.2.5. Pāc 67 M	xli
8.2.6. Pāc 79 M	xli
8.2.7. Pāc 89 M	xlii
8.2.8. Sekh 36	xlii
9. Classification system	
9.1. General statement	xlii
9.2. Differences between the terminology in Kkh and Sp	xlvi
9.3. Deviations in the classifications of Kkh and Sp	lvii
9.4. Faults in the classification	lviii
10. Guidelines	xlix
[I. The Commentary on the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha]	
[A. The Account of the Inception of the Book]	1
[B. The Commentary on the Introduction]	2
[C. The Section of Rules Entailing Defeat]	
1. The commentary on the first rule entailing defeat	55
2. The commentary on the second rule entailing defeat	93
3. The commentary on the third rule entailing defeat	110

4. The commentary on the fourth rule entailing defeat	119
[The commentary on the Pārājika conclusion]	124
[D. The Section of Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting of the Saṅgha]	
1. The commentary on the rule about the emission of semen	127
2. The commentary on the rule about bodily contact	131
3. The commentary on the rule about lewd speech	134
4. The commentary on the rule about ministering to his own sensual pleasure	136
5. The commentary on the rule about [acting as] a go-between	139
6. The commentary on the rule about making a hut	143
7. The commentary on the rule about building a dwelling-place	150
8. The commentary on the rule about being corrupted and corrupting ..	150
9. The commentary on the rule about belonging to another category ...	156
10. The commentary on the rule about a split in the saṅgha	160
11. The commentary on the rule about followers of [one creating] a split	163
12. The commentary on the rule about being difficult to speak to	165
13. The commentary on the rule about a corrupter of families	167
[The commentary on the Saṅghādisesa conclusion]	170
[E. The Section of Indefinite Rules]	
1. The commentary on the first indefinite rule	181
2. The commentary on the second indefinite rule	185
[F. The Section of Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture]	
[a. The section about robes]	
1. The commentary on the rule about <i>kathina</i>	187
2. The commentary on the storehouse rule	202
3. The commentary on the rule about untimely robe material	206
4. The commentary on the rule about old robes	216
5. The commentary on the rule about formally accepting robes	219
6. The commentary on the rule about asking a non-relative	221
7. The commentary on the rule about more than that	223
8. The commentary on the first rule about laid by	225
9. The commentary on the second rule about laid by	228
10. The commentary on the rule about kings	229
[b. The section about sheep's wool]	
11. The commentary on the rule about silk	236
12. The commentary on the rule about pure black [sheep's wool]	237
13. The commentary on the rule about two portions	238
14. The commentary on the rule about six years	239
15. The commentary on the rule about a sitting [rug]	240
16. The commentary on the rule about sheep's wool	241
17. The commentary on the rule about having sheep's wool washed ..	243

Contents

vii

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 18. The commentary on the rule about gold | 243 |
| 19. The commentary on the rule about money transactions | 247 |
| 20. The commentary on the rule about buying and selling | 248 |

[c. The section about bowls]

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 21. The commentary on the rule about bowls | 250 |
| 22. The commentary on the rule about less than five mends | 252 |
| 23. The commentary on the rule about medicines | 256 |
| 24. The commentary on the rule about rains robes | 260 |
| 25. The commentary on the rule about taking robes away | 265 |
| 26. The commentary on the rule about asking for thread | 267 |
| 27. The commentary on the rule about the great weaver | 269 |
| 28. The commentary on the rule about special robes | 271 |
| 29. The commentary on the rule about dangerous | 273 |
| 30. The commentary on the rule about apportioned | 277 |

[G. The Section of Rules Entailing Expiation]

[a. The section about lying]

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 1. The commentary on the rule about lying | 280 |
| 2. The commentary on the rule about abusive speech | 281 |
| 3. The commentary on the rule about malicious speech | 283 |
| 4. The commentary on the rule about [reciting] the Doctrine word
by word | 285 |
| 5. The commentary on the first rule about lying down together | 287 |
| 6. The commentary on the second rule about lying down together | 289 |
| 7. The commentary on the rule about teaching the Doctrine | 290 |
| 8. The commentary on the rule about announcing what is true | 292 |
| 9. The commentary on the rule about announcing a gross offence | 294 |
| 10. The commentary on the rule about digging the earth | 297 |

[b. The section about the plant category]

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 11. The commentary on the rule about the plant category | 300 |
| 12. The commentary on the rule about one replying evasively | 304 |
| 13. The commentary on the rule about disparaging | 306 |
| 14. The commentary on the first rule about furnishings | 309 |
| 15. The commentary on the second rule about furnishings | 313 |
| 16. The commentary on the rule about encroaching | 317 |
| 17. The commentary on the rule about throwing out | 320 |
| 18. The commentary on the rule about a lofty hut | 322 |
| 19. The commentary on the rule about a large dwelling place | 325 |
| 20. The commentary on the rule about containing living beings | 330 |

[c. The section about instruction]

- | | |
|--|-----|
| 21. The commentary on the rule about instruction | 332 |
| 22. The commentary on the rule about sunset | 335 |

23. The commentary on the rule about bhikkhunī's quarters	336
24. The commentary on the rule about material gain	338
25. The commentary on the rule about giving robe material	339
26. The commentary on the rule about sewing robe material	340
27. The commentary on the rule about arrangements	341
28. The commentary on the rule about embarking on a boat	344
29. The commentary on the rule about prepared	345
30. The commentary on the rule about sitting in secret	348
[d. The section about food]	
31. The commentary on the rule about meals in public rest houses	348
32. The commentary on the rule about food [accepted] by a group	350
33. The commentary on the rule about food in [irregular] sequence ..	353
34. The commentary on the rule about Kāññā's mother	356
35. The commentary on the first rule about invitations	358
36. The commentary on the second rule about invitations	369
37. The commentary on the rule about eating at the wrong time	371
38. The commentary on the rule about storing up	372
39. The commentary on the rule about fine foods	379
40. The commentary on the rule about tooth sticks	382
[e. The section about naked ascetics]	
41. The commentary on the rule about naked ascetics	389
42. The commentary on the rule about dismissing	390
43. The commentary on the rule about with [its] food" (or: "with [its] sexual enjoyment [going on]"")	392
44. The commentary on the rule about sitting down in secret on a screened [seat]	393
45. The commentary on the rule about sitting down in secret	393
46. The commentary on the rule about visiting	394
47. The commentary on the rule about Mahānāma	396
48. The commentary on the rule about an army in array	398
49. The commentary on the rule about staying with an army	400
50. The commentary on the rule about battlefields	401
[f. The section about drinking alcoholic drinks]	
51. The commentary on the rule about drinking alcoholic drinks	402
52. The commentary on the rule about tickling with fingers	404
53. The commentary on the rule about sporting	405
54. The commentary on the rule about disrespect	407
55. The commentary on the rule about frightening	408
56. The commentary on the rule about fires	409
57. The commentary on the rule about bathing	411
58. The commentary on the rule about discolouring	412

Contents

ix

59. The commentary on the rule about assigning	414
60. The commentary on the rule about hiding	419
[g. The section about living beings]	
61. The commentary on the rule about intentionally	421
62. The commentary on the rule about containing living beings	422
63. The commentary on the rule about re-opening	422
64. The commentary on the rule about gross offences	424
65. The commentary on the rule about less than twenty years	426
66. The commentary on the rule about a caravan of thieves	428
67. The commentary on the rule about arrangements	430
68. The commentary on the rule about Arittha	430
69. The commentary on the rule about common enjoyment together with one who is suspended	433
70. The commentary on the rule about Kāntaka	436
[h. The section about legitimately]	
71. The commentary on the rule about legitimately	439
72. The commentary on the rule about perplexity	441
73. The commentary on the rule about deception	442
74. The commentary on the rule about a blow	445
75. The commentary on the rule about the palm of the hand	446
76. The commentary on the rule about unfounded	447
77. The commentary on the rule about intentionally	448
78. The commentary on the rule about eavesdropping	449
79. The commentary on the rule about objecting to procedures	451
80. The commentary on the rule about going not having given [his] consent (proxy vote)	462
81. The commentary on the rule about weak	464
82. The commentary on the rule about apportioning	481
[i. The section about treasures]	
83. The commentary on the rule about the bedchamber	481
84. The commentary on the rule about treasures	483
85. The commentary on the rule about entering a village at the wrong time	486
86. The commentary on the rule about needle-cases	488
87. The commentary on the rule about beds and seats	490
88. The commentary on the rule about covered with cotton	491
89. The commentary on the rule about a sitting cloth	493
90. The commentary on the rule about an itch-covering cloth	494
91. The commentary on the rule about a rains cloth	494
92. The commentary on the rule about Nanda	495

x

Overcoming Doubts

[H. The Section of Rules Entailing Confession]

- | | | |
|----|--|-----|
| 1. | The commentary on the first rule entailing confession | 496 |
| 2. | The commentary on the second rule entailing confession | 499 |
| 3. | The commentary on the third rule entailing confession | 500 |
| 4. | The commentary on the fourth rule entailing confession | 503 |

[I. The Section of Rules of Training]

[1. The commentary on the twenty-six rules on proper behaviour]

- | | | |
|--------|---|-----|
| 1. | The commentary on the rule about even all round | 507 |
| 2. | The commentary on the second rule about even all round | 513 |
| 3–4. | The commentary on the rules about being well covered | 514 |
| 5–6. | The commentary on the rules about being well restrained | 515 |
| 7–8. | The commentary on the rules about downcast eyes | 516 |
| 9–10. | The commentary on the rules about [robes] hitched up | 516 |
| 11–12. | The commentary on the rules about a loud laugh | 517 |
| 13–14. | The commentary on the rules about a loud sound | 517 |
| 15–20. | The commentary on the rules about swaying the body, etc..... | 518 |
| 21–22. | The commentary on the rules about “with arms akimbo” | 519 |
| 23–24. | The commentary on the rules about with head covered | 520 |
| 25. | The commentary on the rule about walking on toes or heels | 520 |
| 26. | The commentary on the rule about with [legs] enclosed | 521 |

[2. The commentary on the thirty rules connected with food]

- | | | |
|--------------|--|-----|
| 27 (1). | The commentary on the rule about formally accepting
appreciatively | 521 |
| 28 (2). | The commentary on the rule about formally accepting with
attention to the bowl | 522 |
| 29 (3). | The commentary on the rule about formally accepting curry
in proportion | 522 |
| 30–32 (4–6). | The commentary on the rule about level with the edge, etc. 523 | |
| 33–34 (7–8). | The commentary on the rule about in regular order, etc... 525 | |
| 35 (9). | The commentary on the rule about having crushed a heap (or
having crushed [it] in a heap) | 526 |
| 36 (10). | The commentary on the rule about hiding with rice | 527 |
| 37 (11). | The commentary on the rule about asking for curry and rice .. | 527 |
| 38 (12). | The commentary on the rule about one having the idea of
fault-finding | 528 |
| 39 (13). | The commentary on the rule about a mouthful | 528 |
| 40 (14). | The commentary on the rule about a morsel | 528 |
| 41 (15). | The commentary on the rule about not [yet] brought | 529 |
| 42 (16). | The commentary on the rule about while eating | 529 |
| 43 (17). | The commentary on the rule about [filled] with mouthfuls.... | 529 |
| 44 (18). | The commentary on the rule about lifted balls [of food] | 530 |
| 45 (19). | The commentary on the rule about biting off a mouthful | 530 |

Contents

xi

46 (20). The commentary on the rule about stuffing [the cheeks] full . . .	530
47 (21). The commentary on the rule about shaking the hand to and fro . . .	531
48 (22). The commentary on the rule about scattering rice grains about . . .	531
49 (23). The commentary on the rule about sticking out the tongue . . .	531
50–51 (24–25). The commentary on the rule about making a smacking sound, etc.	532
52–54 (26–28). The commentary on the rule about licking the hand, etc. . .	532
55 (29). The commentary on the rule about soiled by food	533
56 (30). The commentary on the rule about “with rice grains”	533
[3. The commentary on the nineteen rules connected with teaching the Doctrine]	
57 (1). The commentary on the rule about one with an umbrella in his hand	535
58–59 (2–3). The commentary on the rules about one with a staff in his hand, etc.	536
60 (4). The commentary on the rule about one with a weapon in his hand	536
61–62 (5–6). The commentary on the rule about [non-leather] footwear, etc.	537
63 (7). The commentary on the rule about vehicles	538
64 (8). The commentary on the rule about couches	538
65 (9). The commentary on the rule about sitting with [legs] enclosed .	539
66 (10). The commentary on the rule about wrapped	539
67 (11). The commentary on the rule about covered	540
68 (12). The commentary on the rule about on the ground	540
69 (13). The commentary on the rule about low seats	540
70 (14). The commentary on the rule about standing	540
71 (15). The commentary on the rule about going behind	541
72 (16). The commentary on the rule about going beside a path . . .	541
73 (17). The commentary on the rule about defecating while standing up	542
74 (18). The commentary on the rule about defecating on green plants	542
75 (19). The commentary on the rule about defecating in water . . .	543
[J. The Commentary on the Settlement of Legal Cases]	
Appendices	559
Glossary	590
Acknowledgements	605
Sigla	605
Abbreviations	605
References: Primary Literature	609
References: Secondary Literature	617

PREFACE

A first rough translation of the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī* was prepared by Kenneth Roy Norman while working on the new edition of the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī* (Kkh E^e 2003) together with William Pruitt. It was based on the first Pali Text Society edition of this text made by Dorothy Maskell (Kkh E^e 1981). The translation served as a means for editing the text, that is, it was a simple translation to roughly understand the contents. This translation has been thoroughly revised, heavily annotated, and adjusted to the new *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī* edition (Kkh E^e 2003). For this revised translation the parallel passages in the *Samantapāsādikā* have been taken into account, as well as statements in other legal Pāli texts, especially the commentarial literature. There exist two subcommentaries on the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*, an older one, the anonymous *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī-purāṇatīkā* which most probably originated in the tenth century CE, and Buddhanāga's *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī-abhinavaṭīkā*, called *Vinayatthamañjūsā Līnatthappakāsanī Mātikāṭṭhakathā*, written probably between 1165 and 1186 CE. The first of these ṭīkās is quite short and often does not contain comments on specific rules; the second is not very genuine. Buddhanāga frequently borrows his explanations from the *Samantapāsādikā*. Since the *Pātimokkha* is not only transmitted extra-canonically, but also as the core of the *Sutta-vibhaṅga* — the first part of the monastic code (*Vinaya*) — the subcommentaries on the *Samantapāsādikā* can also be taken into account with success, as can the commentaries to the various *Vinaya* condensations (*Mūlasikkhā*, *Khuddasikkhā*, and *Vinaya-vinicchaya* as well as *Uttara-vinicchaya*) which originated after the *Samantapāsādikā*.¹

Concerning the responsibilities for the translation, the credit for the first complete translation goes to K.R. Norman. Although this translation has been completely revised, in cases of explanations of compounds, of grammatical matters, etc., as well as in lists of everyday objects, it could often be taken over with only minor adjustments. Due to problems associated with old age, Mr Norman was not able to help

¹ The relationship of these condensations to the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī* have not yet been investigated.

with the revision of this translation. Thus, the responsibility for the final translation lies with Petra Kieffer-Pülz and William Pruitt: the former thoroughly revised and annotated the translation, the latter checked her translation, turned clumsy expressions and incomprehensible passages into readable English, hinted at inconsistencies, etc. This was again checked by Kieffer-Pülz, and then again by Pruitt. In sending the portions back and forth and discussing translations which did not convince the one or the other, the translation took its final shape. Petra Kieffer-Pülz systematically searched the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī* for parallels it has with the *Samantapāśādikā*. Such parallels are mentioned in the first layer of footnotes. A complete list will be published in the second volume. The decision about which explanations should be included as appendices because they were too long to be included in footnotes was William Pruitt's. He also suggested the inclusion of a glossary in order to avoid the many repetitions of constantly reappearing terms.

The *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī* does not include the entire text commented on, i.e. the *Pātimokkhas*, but only the catchwords explained. In order to present the text commented on together with the commentary a translation of each *Pātimokkha* rule is prefixed to the respective commentary. Likewise the headings of the rules are inserted before the rules, although they actually appear as subheadings in the text. We thus follow the presentation of the 2003 edition of the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*.

We decided to publish the translation in two volumes: volume one with the commentary on the entire Bhikkhu *Pātimokkha*, and volume two containing the commentary on the Bhikkhunī *Pātimokkha* as well as various indices to both volumes. The latter will be published in the not too distant future.

Petra Kieffer-Pülz, Weimar

William Pruitt, Calne

TRANSLATORS' INTRODUCTION

I. TEXT

The *Kaṅkhāvitaranī* (Kkh) is a commentary on the Pātimokkhas of the bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs — the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha and the Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha — and contains the rules for monks and nuns respectively. These Pātimokkhas form the core of the first part of the Vinaya-piṭaka, the *Sutta-vibhaṅga*, where they are complemented by introductory stories, a word commentary, a casuistry, a non-offence clause, and, in nine cases, by collections of cases called *Vinītavatthu*.¹ In addition to the transmission within the Vinaya, the Pātimokkhas were handed down as separate texts independently from the Vinaya with a general introduction at the beginning for both texts.² Kkh is a commentary on these separately transmitted Pātimokkhas.³ Unlike the Vinaya commentary called *Samantapāsādikā* (Sp), which has been attributed to Buddhaghosa since at least the tenth century CE,⁴ and

¹ For the structure of the *Suttavibhaṅga*, see von Hinüber 1996a: §§ 221–25; Kieffer-Pülz 2015a: 433.

² This introduction is not found in the Vinaya and is different from the ones published in modern editions of the Pātimokkha (von Hinüber 1996a: § 222 and n. 394). The introduction commented upon is contained in the Pātimokkha edition by Norman and Pruitt (Pāt 2–7).

³ von Hinüber 1995a: 15 [2009: 196] n. 24.

⁴ The oldest commentary on Sp, the *Vajirabuddhitīkā* (Vjb) originated after the ninth and before the eleventh century CE, and most probably in the tenth century CE; see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 70–107. The second half of the tenth century CE is suggested by Dimitrov (2016: 467–512) on the assumption that Vjb was written by the Sinhalese monk scholar Ratnamati. Though the time frame is the same as suggested by us, the hypothesis that Ratnamati is the author of Vjb still needs to be proved in our opinion. The Vjb 1,13–16 states:

*Samantapāsādikasaññitāya
Sambuddhaghosācariyoditāya
samāsato līnapade likhissam
samāsato līnapade likhī tam.*

“[With the thought that] I will write concisely on the difficult words of [the commentary] called *Samantapāsādikā* uttered by the teacher Sambuddhagosa, I concisely wrote this [commentary] on the difficult words.”

For a different understanding and translation of this passage, see Dimitrov 2016: 475f.

which assembles a variety of interpretations for each and every rule.¹ Kkh is a concise commentary, explaining the meaning and intention of the words in the rules, clarifying important content-related matters, and adding a complete classification at the end of the commentary on each individual rule (see below, pp. xliff.). Its author made ample use of Sp but in general gives only a single interpretation, namely the one that was authoritative at the time the author was writing or according to his own opinion. Even if an interpretation happens to be a statement from an earlier source — explicitly mentioned in Sp — the source's name is normally omitted.² The author of Kkh skilfully weaves together the interpretations borrowed from Sp with his own terse statements.³ Only rarely does he take over larger sections without any change (see below, pp. xxxiiif.).

2. AUTHOR

Like Sp, Kkh too is ascribed to Buddhaghosa by tradition. This ascription can be traced back to around the tenth century CE because the old *Tikā* to Kkh⁴ in its introductory stanza states that the *Mātikāṭṭhakathā* was composed by venerable Buddhaghosa.⁵ However, if we put to

The ascription of Sp to Buddhaghosa is not without question. Von Hintüber (1996a: § 220) suggests that Sp was probably written by at least three authors: a historian, a theologian, and a lawyer.

¹ The authoritative interpretations are put in final position (Sp 300,8f.; see von Hintüber 1996b: 107; Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I [Z 36] [2]).

² Except for two cases: the *Kurundī* is mentioned in Kkh 237,10; the *Mahā-paccarī* in Kkh 189,7. See below, p. xxix.

³ An example for his regular way of including reused text can be seen from Kieffer-Pülz 2016a: 15f.

⁴ The old commentary on Kkh, the *Kaṇkhāvitarañī-purāṇāṭkā* (Kkh-pt), is an anonymous, undated, and untitled commentary. It was written after the oldest, also undated, Vinaya commentary, the *Vjb*, which most probably originated in the tenth century CE (see p. xv, n. 4), before the *Sāratthadīpanī* (Sp-t), which was written at the end of the twelfth century CE (Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 27–29).

⁵ Kkh-pt 1,4–6: *Buddhañ dhammañ ca saṅghañ ti* (Kkh 1,5) *ādinā yā pakāsitañ Bhadantabuddhaghosena Mātikāṭṭhakathā subhā tassā hi līnapadāñ vikāsa-nako 'yam ārambho.* “This is the beginning illuminating difficult words of exactly that shining commentary on the *Mātikās* (i.e. *Pātimokkhas*) which was made known by the venerable Buddhaghosa [with the words] **the Buddha, the Dhamma, the Saṅgha.**”

Translators' Introduction

xvii

one side the so-called “Buddhaghosa colophon”¹ attached to all the texts ascribed to this monk scholar, neither Sp nor Kkh contain any information about their respective authors. Sp was written at the initiative of an otherwise unknown monk Buddhasiri (Sp I 2,13; VII 1415,15), Kkh at the request of the otherwise unknown Soṇa Thera (Kkh 1,13; 370,3). Kkh quotes silently and openly from Sp. This contributes to a similarity in style which may have supported the assumption of one author for both.

Nevertheless, there are deviations between the two texts. These may partly result from the chronological development, since Kkh is younger and represents a more developed stage from the legal point of view (see below, p. xxiii). But partly they may also result from differences in the transmission lines of the Vinaya (Sp) and the Pātimokkha (Kkh) or in the tradition of the various Buddhist Theravāda countries (Burma/Myanmar, Sri Lanka, Thailand). This is especially valid for titles of chapters and rules’ headings (see below, pp. xxxivff.). Yet, deviations in the technical vocabulary (see below, p. xlvi) or a different classification of a rule (see below, pp. xlviif.), if they do not result from a chronological development, are difficult to reconcile with the idea of a common author. The same holds true concerning the deviations in the arrangement of the Nissaggiya-Pācittiya rules for nuns in the two received transmission lines (Sp and Kkh), where Sp has an arrangement of the rules that is more consistent from the point of view of content, and also more in line with the arrangements in other Buddhist schools’ Prātimokṣas. Kkh considerably deviates from it without commenting on this with a single word.² This makes it highly likely that Sp and Kkh are not written by the same author.

Kkh has an introductory as well as a concluding section with information concerning the text. It begins with six śloka stanzas (*ganṭhā-rambha-kathā*, Kkh 1,5–16), the first of which contains the author’s

This is confirmed by Kkh-nṭ 119,12f.: *yā katā Buddhaghosena therena thira-*
cetasā | Kañkhāvitaraṇī nāma Mātikāṭṭhakathā subhā, ... tam aham vaṇṇayai-
ssāmi ... “The shining commentary on the Mātikās named Kañkhāvitaraṇī,
 which was compiled by the Elder Buddhaghosa with steadfast mind, this I will
 explain”

¹ See below, p. xxii.

² Kieffer-Pülz 2016b: 72ff.

homage to the Triple Gem,¹ consisting in a simple mention of the Buddha, the Dhamma, and the Saṅgha.² This is quite bare compared to the introductory stanzas of the commentaries safely attributed to Buddhaghosa and Dhammapāla,³ where each of the three gems is described in more detail and characterised by various adjectives. This also holds true for the Samantapāśādikā, where the Buddha, the Dhamma, and the Saṅgha are each described in detail in separate stanzas.⁴ The second stanza of Kkh contains the author's homage to the former teachers (Kkh 1,8: *pubbācariyasīhānam namo katvā*).⁵ This is unusual in the *Atṭhakathā* layer.⁶ Some Tīkās from the twelfth century CE onwards — all belonging to Sāriputta and his various pupils — add instead a homage to their respective teacher after the homage to the

¹ Concerning the homage to the three jewels, Cousins (forthcoming) states: “[it] is not found in the Visuddhimagga nor in any surviving work prior to this. It is nearly universal in the *atṭhakathā* literature.”

² Kkh 1,5f.: *Buddham Dhammañ ca Saṅghañ ca vippasannena cetasā, vandityā ...*

³ See Buddhaghosa's commentaries on D, M, S, and A; and Dhammapāla's commentaries on It, Ud, Cp, Nett, Tha, Thī, Vv, and Pv.

⁴ Sp I 1, vv. 1–3 (translation ID 1):

*yo kappakoṭīhi pi appameyyam
kālam laronto atidukkarāni,
khedañ gato lokahitāya nātho
namo mahākārūpikassa tassa. (v. 1)
asambudhañ buddhanisevitam yam
bhavābhavam gacchati jīvaloko,
namo avijjādikilesajāla-
vidhamsino dhammavarassa tassa. (v. 2)
guṇehi yo sīlasamādhīpaññā-
vimuttīñānappabhuñīhi yutto
khettañ janānam kusalatthikānam
tam ariyasaṅgham sirasā namāmi. (v. 3)*

⁵ Though former teachers (*pubbācariyasīhānam*) are mentioned in Dhammapāla's *atṭhakathā* commentaries (Ud-a 2,2; It-a 2,2, etc.), this only refers to those whose interpretation of canonical texts were still relevant; they are not the object of a homage.

⁶ Khuddas-pṭ 57.7 (*pubbācariyapādesu thapetvā sīsam attano*); Sacc-viv (UPT 524, photo 1013) fol. ji r2 (*katvā porānācariyapādesu añjalīpuṭam*); Mūlas-ṭ 457-sf. (*ācariyānam siram mama thapetvāna*).

Translators' Introduction

xix

Triple Gem.¹ But in at least one other *Tīkā*, from the early thirteenth century CE, the homage to the Triple Gem is followed by a homage to earlier teachers followed by a homage to the author's personal teacher.² In the third stanza the author refers to the text he is going to comment upon, the *Pātimokkha*. The fourth stanza says the author was asked to comment on the *Pātimokkha* by Elder Soṇa, "devoted to the practice of the Discipline" (*vinayācārayutta*). In the two final stanzas the author explains that he is going to write a commentary, gives its title, states that it serves the purpose of overcoming doubts which bhikkhus might have concerning the *Pātimokkha*, and informs the reader that it is based on "the way of the recitation of the inhabitants of the Mahāvihāra". Thus, Kkh is explicitly characterised as a work of the Mahāvihāra tradition. Nevertheless, none of its sources are mentioned specifically.

Kkh ends with a colophon consisting in seven śloka stanzas (Kkh 370,1–16). Much of the information given in the introductory stanzas is repeated in them. Again, the author states that he wrote the commentary with the aim of overcoming doubts, asked to do so by Elder Soṇa (v. 1); he says he based his commentary on the manner of the recitation of the inhabitants of the Mahāvihāra and adds that he thereby follows the method of the old *Sīhaṭṭhakathā* (v. 2). This information is new. *Sīhaṭṭhakathā* is a collective term used for a number of earlier commentaries such as the *Kurundī*, *Mahāpaccarī*, and *Mahaṭṭhakathā*, all quoted in Sp. But in Kkh, *Sīhaṭṭhakathā* stands for *Sīhaṭṭ-*

¹ In addition to the homage to the Triple Gem, Sāriputta in his Sp-ṭ (I 1,11, 17) and Mp-nṭ (I 1,10, 16) pays homage to his teacher Kassapa and the *anubhera* Sumedha. Sumanigala in his Abhidh-av-nṭ and Abhidh-s-mhṭ pays homage to his teacher Sāriputta. Saṅgharakkhita in his Mogg-p-ṭ (I,5–14) pays homage to his teacher for grammar, Moggallāna (Kieffer-Püllz 2017: 27); in his Subodh-p-ṭ (1,7–22) to his teachers in general (Kieffer-Püllz 2017: 34); and in his Khuddas-nṭ (237,4–13) he pays homage to the Buddha and the Dhamma, and to his teacher Sāriputta (probably his teacher in Vinaya matters; Kieffer-Püllz 2017: 36).

² Vācissara in his Vin-vn-ṭ pays homage to the Triple Gem (vv. 1–3), the former teachers (v. 4), and his teacher Sāriputta (v. 5; Vin-vn-ṭ I 1f.; Kieffer-Püllz forthcoming).

mātikāṭṭhakathā or the Vinayaṭṭhakathā (i.e., the Samantapāśādikā)¹ if we follow the new Kkh sub-commentary (Kkh-nṭ 487.1f.). Except for a single reference to the Sīhaṭamātikāṭṭhakathā in Kkh and this remark on it in Kkh-nṭ, this text is not mentioned elsewhere. Also new in comparison to the introductory stanzas is the statement that the Kkh author took the essence (*sāra*) from the *aṭṭhakathā* or *aṭṭhakathās* (whether the word is used in the singular or plural is unclear since it forms the first part of a compound in v. 3). This might refer directly to the old Aṭṭhakathās on the Pātimokkhas, or on the Vinaya, or indirectly to the same Aṭṭhakathās as the ones quoted in Sp.² Given that Kkh includes not even a single independent quotation from an early Aṭṭhakathā (see below, pp. xxixf.), whereas it contains many literal parallels to Sp, it is most probable that this statement refers to Sp. It nevertheless could well include the old Aṭṭhakathās which are quoted there. Interestingly we find a similar statement only in the concluding stanzas of Buddhadatta's Vinaya-vinicchaya (Vin-vn).³ In his commentary on it (early thirteenth

¹ The idea of a Vinayaṭṭhakathā which is not identical with the Samantapāśādikā, brought up by Jayawickrama (*ID* xxiiif.), can be dismissed since the relevant quotations are found in Sp as well.

² Kkh-nṭ 487.2f.: *aṭṭhakathāsāraṇ ti* (Kkh 370.8) *Sīhaṭamātikāṭṭhakathāyam atthasāram, atha vā Vinayaṭṭhakathāsu atthasāram.* “The essence from the Aṭṭhakathā(s) means: the essential sense from the Sīhaṭamātikāṭṭhakathā or the essential sense from the Vinayaṭṭhakathās.”

³ Vin-vn vv. 2439–40:

*ubhatopātimokkhānaṇ savibhaṅgānam eva yo
attho aṭṭhakathāsāro so ca vutto visesato* (v. 2439)
*tañ ca sabbam samādāya Vinayassa vinicchayo
bhikkhūnaṇ bhikkhunīnañ ca hitatthāya kato mayā.* (v. 2440).

“Which meaning of the two Pātimokkhas together with their explanations is the essential one in the Aṭṭhakathās, and is stated thoroughly, having taken up that in its entirety, the explanation of the Vinaya (Vinayavinicchaya) has been compiled by me for the benefit of the bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs.”

The *ṭīkā* author understands *aṭṭhakathāsāro* as referring to all the Aṭṭhakathās, cited in Sp (Vin-vn-t II 125.16–19: *savibhaṅgānam ubhatovibhaṅgasahitānam ubhatopātimokkhānaṇ bhikkhūnaṇ bhikkhunīnañ ca pātimokkhānaṇ aṭṭhakathāsāro sabbaṭṭhakathānaṇ sārabhūto yo so attho visesato Samantapāśādikāyam vutto. ...* “Which meaning of the two Pātimokkhas, [that is] the Pātimokkhas of the bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs, together with their

Translators' Introduction

xxi

century CE), Vācissara refers this to all the Aṭṭhakathās quoted in Sp. Buddhadatta's work not only here shows similarities with Kkh, but also in the chapter on "origination" (*samuṭṭhāna*), i.e. the manner of the arising of offences, in his *Uttara-vinicchaya* (Utt-vn; see below, pp. xxvif.). Thus it is highly likely that *aṭṭhakathā-sāra* is used in the same sense in both texts.

With respect to the text (*pāli*), that is, the Pātimokkhas, the colophon says that Kkh covers everything (v. 3). Thus the Kkh author worked selectively concerning the Aṭṭhakathā(s),¹ but inclusively with respect to the text commented upon. This corresponds to what we see in Kkh itself. In the fourth stanza we are informed that Kkh does not contain a single word which is in contradiction to the Vinaya or the old Aṭṭhakathās of the Mahāvihāra inhabitants (*mahāvihāravāśinam porāṇaṭṭhakathāhi*, Kkh 370,10). This is given as a reason why the Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī is "overcoming doubts" and should be studied by one searching benefit (v. 5). If this colophon belonged to the text from the beginning, this would suggest that the Kkh author used the early Aṭṭhakathā(s) without quoting them openly. But if the colophon was added later, it could be an assumption of the later tradition that the author of Kkh used the older commentaries directly. Finally, the extent of the text of Kkh is given as corresponding to twenty-two *bhāṇavaras*. One *bhāṇvara* corresponds to 8,000 syllables or 250 *ganthas* (*gāthās*, each consisting of 32 syllables).² Thus Kkh would extend to about 176,000 syllables, which roughly corresponds to the estimation of its length.³ In the last stanza it is stated that Kkh reached completion without any obstacle and was based on what is beneficial (*kalyāna-nissitā*). Then the

explanations, [that is] together with the explanations of both [Pātimokkhas as handed down in the Vinaya], is the essential one in the commentaries [to them, that is] the essence of all commentaries [to them], is stated thoroughly in the Samantapāśādikā. ..."

¹ For a practical commentary this is strictly necessary. As Sp, which presents a multitude of interpretations, shows, incorporating a large variety of interpretations renders a commentary encyclopedic but difficult to manage in practice.

² See von Hinüber 1995b: 131.

³ Projected on the basis of the counted syllables of three pages of the Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī (two and a half characters correspond to one syllable). Thus the text according to this estimation would comprise about 163,280 syllables.

wish is expressed that all beings may quickly attain the pleasures of the mind (*manorathā*; v. 7).

Whether this colophon stems from the author of Kkh or was added only later is unclear. It is not commented upon in the old *tīkā* to the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī* (Kkh-pṭ 117,23f., after the tenth century CE), but only in the new commentary (Kkh-nṭ 486,18–87,10) that probably dates from between 1165 and 1186 CE.¹ Thus it could have been added after the composition of Kkh-pṭ and before that of Kkh-nṭ. Given the fact that the colophon repeats much of the content of the introductory stanzas and adds only little that is new, which, in addition, to the largest part could have been deduced from the text itself, it cannot be excluded that, in fact, it is a later addition.

Some editions and manuscripts of Kkh furthermore contain the so-called “Buddhaghosa colophon” mentioned above.² Kkh E^e 2003 and Kkh C^e have the Kkh colophon,³ followed by the *samuṣṭhāna* chapter from the Parivāra⁴ — which here is clearly misplaced — again followed by the Buddhaghosa colophon.⁵

3. DATE

Terminus post quem for the redaction of Kkh is the date of Sp, which the Kkh author quotes explicitly. As is well known, the date of Sp is unclear. According to its colophon it was begun in the twentieth year of the reign of a king named Sirinivāsa Siripāla and completed in his twenty-first year (Sp VII 1415,17–20). This king has been identified with king Mahānāma (reigned 406–28 or 409–31) without convincing reasons. Accordingly, Sp is dated to the years 426/7 (429/30) CE by those who accept this identification. Sp might also have been written earlier, in the reign of Upatissa I (365–406), which then would lead to

¹ Kieffer-Pülz 2015b: 434.

² Kkh B^e 1912: 231,6–20 (Kkh colophon), 231,21–32,8 (Buddhaghosa colophon).
Kkh B^e (CSCD) 356,6–21 (Kkh colophon), 357,1–15 (Buddhaghosa colophon).

³ Kkh C^e 236,15–28 (Kkh colophon), 240,20–30 (Buddhaghosa colophon). Kkh E^e 1981 does not contain a colophon but ends with the Sekhiya section. The colophon was printed separately by von Hinüber (1995b: 131f.).

⁴ Kkh E^e 2003: 370,1–16; Kkh C^e 236,15–28.

⁵ Kkh E^e 2003: 370,17–74,19 = Kkh C^e 237,1–40,10 = Vin V 88,2–90,5.

⁵ Kkh E^e 2003: 375,1–15; Kkh C^e 240,20–30.

Translators' Introduction

xxiii

| 386/7 or 385/6 CE for its composition.¹ Terminus ante quem is the date
| of its translation by Saṅghabhadra into Chinese in 489 CE.²

| From this point of view, Kkh could have been initiated in the late
| fourth or fifth century CE at the earliest. From some discrepancies
| between Kkh and Sp it results that Kkh represents a younger, more
| developed stage. To these discrepancies belong the so-called five points
| (*pañca thānāni*) mentioned in Sp in connection with the rule of theft,
| namely object (*vatthu*), time (*kāla*), place (*desa*), value (*aggha*), and use
| (*paribhoga*). They are reduced to three points in Kkh, namely time,
| place, and increasing and decreasing value of the object by use (Kkh
| 47,26–48,2; see below, p. 109).³ Another discrepancy is the definition of
| theft by giving up one's legal claim (*dhuranikkhepa*). It is solely linked
| to goods deposited earlier in Sp (II 304,20f.) and extended to real estate
| and to cases where temporary goods were not returned and no compen-
| sation was given in Kkh (44,4ff.).⁴ Further elements are the constituent
| factors (*aṅga*) for an offence, which in Kkh are given for each
| Pātimokkha rule in the classification at the end of the rule⁵ (see below,
| p. xlivi), but are neither listed in the Parivāra nor in Sp. In addition, the
| complete classification system is more developed, formulated in a more
| concise and structured way, and placed at the end of each rule in a
| systematic arrangement. These elements show that some time separates
| Kkh from Sp.

| In the context of the first Pārājika rule Kkh quotes a stanza, intro-
| duced by *evam* (“thus”; Kkh 36,25f.; see below, p. 78) which summarizes

¹ For more details, see Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 163–167. Von Hintüber (1996a: § 209) gives 429/30 or 369/370 which result from continuing to count the dis-
crepancy between the two chronologies erroneously even for the time after
Mahāsena (Cousins 1998: 156).

² English translation by Bapat and Hirakawa 1970.

³ Kieffer-Pülz 2011: 20f. Interestingly Dhammasiri's Khuddasikkhā, v. 4 —
supposedly written by a pupil of Buddhaghosa (Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 194ff.)
— on this point clearly follows Sp, not Kkh. This could be evidence that Kkh
was written later than Khuddas, but it needs further investigation. Though
Vin-vn and Utt-vn resemble Kkh in some points, Buddhadatta also clearly
follows Sp here (Vin-vn v. 44).

⁴ Kieffer-Pülz 2011: 18 n. 36.

⁵ Kieffer-Pülz 2011: 22.

the various kinds of origins of offences with one, two, three, four, and six¹ origins. The same stanza is handed down as v. 335 in Buddhadatta's *Utt-vn*. Buddhadatta is an author situated in South India, and according to the later tradition a younger contemporary of Buddhaghosa. His *Vin-vn* as well as his *Utt-vn* are assumed to have been written some time after Sp.² Although Buddhadatta in his *Vin-vn* refers to a king called Accutavikkanta³ of the ruling family of the Kalamb(h)a or Kalabbha (Kaṭabhra) dynasty, this does not help in dating him. Even the terminus ante quem (600 CE (?)) for the supposed end of the alleged Kaṭabhra dynasty does not seem to be acceptable.⁴ Thus the date of its commentary, early thirteenth century CE, is the terminus ante quem for this text. The stanza runs as follows:

[Offences] with one origin are of three kinds.⁵ [Offences that] originated by two [origins] are of five kinds.⁶ [Offences] with the state (*sthāna*) of three and four origins are of two kinds.⁷ [An offence that] originated by six [origins] is of one kind.¹

¹ No offence has five origins.

² According to von Hinüber (1996: § 325) it quotes statements from the Kurundī at the same place as Sp which makes it likely that its author used this early commentary via Sp.

³ *Vin-vn* v. 3179 E^e B^e *Accutavikkante Kalambakulanandane* (v.l. *Kalambha^o*, *Kalabbha^o*; ^o*vaddhane*).

⁴ Gillet (2014: 15ff.) considers the entire Kaṭabhra dynasty to be of "fictive nature".

⁵ By the possible combinations of the six causes for the arising of an offence (1. body; 2. speech; 3. body and speech; 4. body and thought; 5. speech and thought; 6. body, speech, and thought) thirteen categories emerge, each named after the first rule in which it appears (I–XIII; for the list see von Hinüber 1992a: 61). Three of the thirteen categories have only one possible origin, namely (I) *paṭhamapārājika* (origin: body and thought); (IV) *samanubhāṣana* (origin: body, speech, and thought); (X) *dhammadesana* (origin: speech and thought).

⁶ (V) *kaṭhina* (origin: 1. body and speech, 2. body, speech and thought); (VI) *eṭakaloma* (origin: 1. body, 2. body and thought); (VII) *padasodhamma* (origin: 1. speech, 2. speech and thought); (IX) *theyyasattha* (origin: 1. body and thought, 2. body, speech, and thought); (XII) *corīvutthāpana* (origin: 1. speech and thought, 2. body, speech, and thought).

⁷ Offences with three origins: (II) *adinnādāna* (origin: 1. body and thought,

Translators' Introduction

xxv

*tidhā ekasamuṭṭhānā pañcadhā dvisamuṭṭhitā
dvidhā ticaturo thānā ekadhā chasamuṭṭhitā ti.*
(Kkh 36,25f. = Utt-vn v. 335).

There are thus three possibilities: (1) Kkh borrowed this verse from Utt-vn, (2) Utt-vn borrowed it from Kkh, or (3) both took it over from an earlier source. In both texts the stanza is introduced by a phrase indicating a following quotation, in Kkh by *evam*, in Utt-vn by *āha ca*.² Though this *āha ca* is quite unique in Utt-vn, which is a verse text, in that it stands in between two verses not included in the metre, and though it seems to be found only in Burmese manuscripts of Utt-vn, it is commented upon in the *Uttara-vinicchaya-tīkā* (Utt-vn-t),³ written most probably by the Sinhalese Vācissara in the first half of the thirteenth century CE.⁴ This proves that in the early thirteenth century CE the phrase *āha ca* was already a fixed part of Utt-vn. As the subject of *āha ca* the *tīkā* author adds “the Aṭṭhakathā teacher” and identifies him with the author of Kkh. Thus, in the thirteenth century it was presumed that Buddhadatta had borrowed this verse from Kkh, which certainly was influenced by the ascription of Kkh to Buddhaghosa, and the assumption that Buddhadatta was a younger contemporary of the latter.

Comparing Kkh and Utt-vn it is obvious that these two texts are very close to each other. Despite the fact that in the further comments on the “origination” system (*samuṭṭhāna*), Utt-vn has elements which resemble the Parivāra chapter on *samuṭṭhāna* (Vin V 86–90), the similarity between Utt-vn and Kkh is much more pronounced, with the only

2. speech and thought, 3. body, speech, and thought); (XI) *bhūtārocana* (origin: 1. body, 2. speech, 3. body and speech); offences with four origins: (VIII) *addhāna* (origin: 1. body, 2. body and speech, 3. body and thought, 4. body, speech, and thought); (XIII) *anamuññāta* (origin: 1. speech, 2. body and speech, 3. speech and thought, 4. body, speech, and thought).

¹ (III) *sañcaritta* (origins: 1. body, 2. speech, 3. body and speech, 4. body and thought, 5. speech and thought, 6. body, speech, and thought).

² Kieffer-Pülz 2014: 70ff. It, by the way, is the only stanza of Utt-vn that is introduced by a phrase.

³ Vin-vn-t II 445,5: *āha ca* [Utt-vn v. 335] *Aṭṭhakathācariyo Mātiκaṭṭha-kathāyam*. “And he says, [i.e.] the teacher of the Aṭṭhakathā [says] in the *Mātiκaṭṭhakathā* (i.e. the *Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī*).”

⁴ Kieffer-Pülz forthcoming.

difference that Kkh is in prose, and Utt-vn in verse. This is documented in the table below, with the corresponding portions put in bold.

<i>Kkh 36.11–37.2</i>	<i>Utt-vn vv. 325–39</i>
sabbāpatṭinām	Vibhaṅgesu pana dvīsu paññattāni Mahesinā yāni pārājikādīni uddisanti uposathe (325) tesaṁ dāni pavakkhāmi samuṭṭhānam ito param pāṭavatthāya bhikkhūnam, tam suṇātha samāhitā (326)
kāyo vācā kāyavācā kāyacittam vācācittam kāyavācācittam ti imāni ekaṅgika-dvaṅgika-tivaṅgikāni cha saṁuṭṭhānāni nāma yāni sikkhā- padasamuṭṭhānānī ti pi vuccanti.	kāyo ca vācāpi ca kāyavācā tān’ eva cittena yutāni tīni ekaṅgikām dvaṅgi-tivaṅgikān ti chadhā saṁuṭṭhānavidhi vadanti (327)
attha purimāni tīni acittakāni pacchimāni sacittakāni	
tesu ekena vā dvīhi vā tīhi vā catūhi vā chahi vā saṁuṭṭhānehi āpattiyo saṁuṭṭhahanti	tesu ekena vā dvīhi tīhi vātha catūhi vā chahi vāpattiyo nānāsaṁuṭṭhānehi jāyare (328)
pañcasamuṭṭhānā nāma natthi tattha ekasamuṭṭhānā nāma catutthena ca pañcamena ca chaṭṭhena ca saṁuṭṭhānenā saṁuṭṭhāti na aññehi	tattha pañcasamuṭṭhānā kā cāpatti na vijjati hoti ekasamuṭṭhānā pacchimeh’ eva tīhi pi (329)
dvisamuṭṭhānā nāma paṭhamā- catutthehi ca dutiya-pañcamehi ca tatiya-chaṭṭhehi ca	tath’ eva dvisamuṭṭhānā kāyato kāyacittato vācato vācacittamhā tatiyacchaṭṭhato pi ca (330)
catuttha-chaṭṭhehi ca pañcamama- chaṭṭhehi ca samuṭṭhānehi saṁuṭṭhāti na aññehi	catuttha-cchaṭṭhato c’ eva pañcamacchaṭṭhato pi ca jāyate pañcadhā v’ esā na (B ^e om.) saṁuṭṭhāti na (E ^e om.) aññato (331)
tisamuṭṭhānā nāma paṭhamehi ca tīhi pacchimehi ca tīhi saṁuṭṭhānehi saṁuṭṭhāti na aññehi	tisamuṭṭhānākā nāma paṭhamehi ca tīhi pi pacchimehi ca tīh’ eva saṁuṭṭhāti na aññato (332)

Translators' Introduction

xxvii

<i>Kkh 36,11–37,2</i>	<i>Utt-vn vv. 325–39</i>
catusamuṭṭhānā nāma paṭhamataṭiya -catuttha-chaṭṭhehi ca	paṭhamā tatiyā c' eva catutthacchatṭhato pi ca
dutiya-tatiya-pañcamā-chaṭṭhehi ca samuṭṭhānehi samuṭṭhāti na aññehi	dutiyā tatiyā c' eva pañcamā-chaṭṭhehi pi ca (333)
chasamuṭṭhānā nāma chahi pi samuṭṭhāti	dvidhā catusamuṭṭhānā jāyate na panaññato ekadhā chasamuṭṭhānā samuṭṭhāti chah' eva hi (334)
evam	āha ca (E ^e om.)
tidhā ekasamuṭṭhānā pañcadhā dvisamuṭṭhitā dvidhā ticaturo ṭhānā (E ^e ti-catur-utṭhānā) ekadhā chasamuṭṭhitā (335)	
ti (E ^e om.)	
samuṭṭhānavasena sabbāva terasa āpattiyo honti. tā paṭhamapaññattisikkhāpadavasena samuṭṭhānato terasa nāmāni labhanti	teras' eva ca nāmāni samuṭṭhānavasena visesato labhantāpattiyo sabbā tāni vakkhāmito param (336)
paṭhamapārājikasamuṭṭhānā- adinnādāna-sañcaritta-samanubhāsana-kathina-elakaloma—	paṭhamantimavatthuñ ca dutiyā sañcarittakam (E ^e sañcarittomakam) samanubhāsanañ c' eva kathinelakalomakam (337)
padasodhamma-addhāna- theyyasattha-dhammadesanā- bhūtārocana-corivuṭṭhāpana	padasodhammam addhānam theyyasatthañ ca desanā bhūtārocana akañ c' eva corivuṭṭhāpanam pi ca (338)
anunuññātasamuṭṭhānā ti ...	anunuññātakañ cā ti (E ^e ceti) sīsān' etāni terasa teras' etc samuṭṭhānanayā viññūhi cintitā (= Vin) (339)

Based on this comparison, either Utt-vn made use of Kkh, or else Kkh made use of Utt-vn. But it is highly unlikely that they resulted in such a similar text independently of each other. If Utt-vn had borrowed from Kkh it would at the same time form the terminus ante quem for the composition of Kkh. However, in order to be able to say more about the

relation of these two texts, a thorough comparison is required, especially since in the Vin-vn Buddhadatta for the most part closely follows the terminology of Sp.¹

If we leave the Buddhadatta texts aside, the terminus ante quem for Kkh is the tenth century CE, because this roughly is the time when Kkh was commented upon in Kkh-pt.²

4. TITLE

The title *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*, “Overcoming Doubts”, is mentioned in the introductory stanzas (Kkh 1,16), in the colophon (Kkh 370,12), and in some other texts,³ but it is also cited as *Mātikāṭṭhakathā* or *Māti-kāṭṭhakathā*, that is, as a commentary (lit. explanation of the meaning) of the lists (*mātikā*), that is, of the Pātimokkhas.⁴

5. SOURCES

Kkh rarely quotes from texts giving sources. In his introductory stanzas, the author only says that he based his commentary on the “way of the recitation of the inhabitants of the Mahāvihāra” (Kkh 1,15). In the concluding stanzas it is said that the commentary entirely relies on “the

¹ Thus, like Sp, he uses the keyword *ti-samutṭhāna* (Vin-vn v. 415, Sgh. 8; v. 887, Niss 30 M; etc.) instead of *adinnādāna-samutṭhāna* (Kkh); but see *adinnādānatulyā* va *samutṭhānādayo nāyā* (Vin-vn v. 846; similar vv. 902, 947, 1044); *catu-samutṭhāna* (Vin-vn v. 1183, Pāc 27 M; v. 1406 Pāc 39 M) instead of *addhāna-samutṭhāna* (Kkh); *dhuranikhepa-samutṭhāna* (Vin-vn v. 2391) instead of *samanubhāsana-samutṭhāna* (Kkh). In the case of *cha-samutṭhāna* (Vin-vn v. 376, Sgh 5 M) instead of *sañcaritta-samutṭhāna* (Kkh), Vin-vn more often, however, also has *sañcaritta-*^o (Vin-vn E^e 46,12; 56,7; 59,32, etc.; see also *sañcaritta-samodayam*, Vin-vn E^e 128,2). The different terms used in Kkh mostly appear in Utt-vn as subheadings (Utt-vn 264,5; etc.) and probably come from the third chapter of the Parivāra.

² A second commentary on Kkh is by Sāriputta’s pupil Buddhanāga (1165–1186 CE). Further commentaries originated in Burma and Siam between the fifteenth and eighteenth century CE. (Kieffer-Pülz 2015b: 434). A *Mātikāṭṭhakathāgantipada* is quoted in Vin-vn-t II 304,4ff.; 316,15–18, 26–17,2; Kkh-pipo 39,16f.; 40,4f., 7f. In addition, at least one Sinhalese glossary (Kkh-pipo) is preserved.

³ For instance in Vjb 96,18; 110,10, 19; 176,10; 210,29; 214,22; 233,10; 238,6; 240,15; 502,14f.; 513,8; Pālim-nt I 347,19; 353,6; etc., Khuddas-pt 115,5; 202,22; etc.

⁴ For references see CSCD.

Translators' Introduction

xxix

method of the Sīhalatṭhakathā” (*Sīhalatṭhakathānaya*, Kkh 370,5), and that all “essential [matters] from the Aṭṭhakathā(s)” (*sabbam aṭṭha-kathāsāraṃ*) have been taken over. As stated above, this could refer to the early Aṭṭhakathās on the Vinaya, to an early Aṭṭhakathā on the Pātimokkhas, or to Sp. The author of Kkh quotes extensively from Sp, mentioning it by name or without attribution, and refers to it for more detailed descriptions. He mentions early commentaries explicitly only three times, and only one of the three references seems to be independent from Sp (see below, pp. xxixf.). Therefore, it is highly likely that Aṭṭhakathā here refers to Sp.

In the fourth stanza it is said that Kkh does not contain a single word that stands in contradiction to the old Aṭṭhakathā(s) (*porāṇaṭṭhakathā*, Kkh 370,10). It remains unclear whether this refers to the Sīhalamāti-kaṭṭhakathā or to the Sīhalatṭhakathās on the Vinaya, and it is not clear whether it is linked to direct usage of these commentaries or only to an indirect use through the quotations transmitted in Sp. Actually, the Kkh author only mentions titles of old Aṭṭhakathās three times, namely, Kurundī (Kkh 237,10), Mahāpaccarī (Kkh 189,7), and Sīhalamāti-kaṭṭhakathā (Kkh 283,15). The first two are commentaries on the Vinaya used extensively in Sp and reckoned there to belong to the Sīhalatṭhakathā.¹ In Kkh the Kurundī is alluded to in the commentary on Pāc 81 M in a long section taken over in its entirety from Sp.² It, therefore, is not used independently. The Mahāpaccarī is quoted in the commentary on Pāc 38 M. The respective sentence has a literal parallel in Sp,³ and a large portion preceding it has a parallel in Sp with only minor deviations.⁴

¹ Von Hinüber 1996a: § 210; Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 190f.

² Kkh 233,19–38,9 is largely taken over from Sp VI 1240,10–45,22 with some minor omissions.

³ Kkh 189,7f. = Sp V 1100,9ff.: *Mahāpaccariyam pana* “*antovuttham hotī*” *ti vuttam*.

⁴ Kkh 188,21–89,7 ≠ Sp V 1105,11–29; deviations are marked in bold: Sp 1105,12: *sambhinnarasam hoti saṃsaṭṭham*, *na vaṭṭati* — Kkh 188,21: *sambhinnarasam vā hoti duddhotapū vā*, *na vaṭṭati*; Sp 1105,15ff.: *sattāhakālikam pi attanā* saddhiṃ saṃsaṭṭham yāvajīvikam attano sabhāvam yeva upaneti — Kkh 188,24f.: *sattāhakālikam yāvajīvikam eva attano sabhāvam yeva upaneti*; Sp 1105,25 imesu ca pana — Kkh 189,2 imesu pana; Sp 1105,29 na janetī ti — Kkh 189,5ff.: na janeti. *akappiyakutiyan anto vutthena pana tena saddhim*

Since Kkh and Sp have the same section, with the same Mahāpaccarī quotation, von Hintüber (1996: § 225) assumes that the Mahāpaccarī quotation was already cited in the old Aṭṭhakathā and that Kkh follows the sequence of the old Aṭṭhakathā whereas Sp shifted the passage to the commentary on the Khandhakas. Von Hinüber excludes the possibility of a simple adoption from Sp, with the argument that the wording is not identical, and assumes that Kkh and Sp both used the old Aṭṭhakathā directly and independently (von Hinüber 1996a: 225). Though the wording is not absolutely identical, it is largely the same in Kkh and Sp (see above, p. xxix, n. 4), and could well hint at a borrowing from Sp. In Sp the section in question ends with the quotative mark *iti* (Sp 1105,²⁹ see p. xxix, n. 4), which could hint at the origin of this passage from an older commentary on the Suttavibhaṅga. In Kkh the *iti* is absent. Instead, a sentence follows for which we have no parallel in Sp, but there is one in Vin-vn.¹ The subsequent sentence then is shared again with Sp. If we assumed that the Kkh author took over this section from an older source, it had to be a source composed in Pāli because the similarity of the wording of Sp and Kkh is too strong for two independent translations. But the question remains which earlier Aṭṭhakathā this could be that already contained a quotation from the Mahāpaccarī, which in turn belongs to the Sīhaṭṭhakathā. This would presuppose a younger Aṭṭhakathā in Pāli using the Sīhaṭṭhakathās as its sources.

One single mention — no quotation — of a Sīhaṭṭamātikāṭṭhakathā (Kkh 283,₁₅) appears in the commentary on the fourth *pārājika* exclusive to nuns (or, if all rules valid for nuns are counted, in their eighth *pārājika*). Although the explanation of the word *avassutā* in Pā 8 N by Kkh deviates from the explanation in Sp with regard to a single

itaradvayam tadahpaticcagahitam pi na vaṭṭati). Kkh 189,7f. = Sp V 1100,9ff. (no deviations).

¹ Kkh 189,5ff.: *akappiyakuṭiyam anto vutthena pana tena saddhiṃ itaradvayam tadahpaticcagahitam pi na vaṭṭati*, see below, p. 377. See Vin-vn E^o vv. 1389f. for a similar statement in the Vin-vn, which presupposes Kkh, not Sp.

*akappiyāya kuṭiyā vutthen' antadvayena tam
gahitam tadahe vā pi dvayam pubbañ na vaṭṭati* (v. 1389).
*mukhasamnidhi nāmāyam antovutthāpi na kappati
iti vuttam dalham katvā Mahāpaccariyam pana* (v. 1390).

Translators' Introduction

xxxii

word — Kkh has *tintā*, Sp *avassutā* — there is a similar explanation in Sp in the context of Pār 1 N.¹ Thus, it is not the difference between *tintā* and *avassutā* which stands out here. Actually, Kkh does not present a quotation from the Sīhalamātikāṭṭhakathā, but refers to the fact that this early commentary gives only the meaning of the word, unlike Sp which also gives an investigation of it. This passage clearly shows that the Kkh author compared the Sīhalamātikāṭṭhakathā with Sp,² and proves

¹ Sp IV 901,5 [Pār 1 N]: *avassutā ti* (Vin IV 213,34) *kāyasamsaggarāgena avassutā tintā kilimā ti attho.* “[She is] **overflowing**, means: [she is] overflowing (=) [she is] wet with desire by means of desire for bodily contact; she is dripping is the meaning.”

² Kkh 283,14–17: *catutthe avassutā ti* (Pāt 120,16) *lokassādamittasantha-vavasena kāyasamsaggarāgena tintā. ayam eva hi attho Sīhalamātikāṭṭhakathāyan vutto. Samantapāsādikāyam panassa vicāraṇā katā.* “In the fourth rule [she is] **overflowing with desire**, means: [she is] wet with desire for bodily contact by virtue of worldly pleasures such as intimacy with friends. For only this meaning is stated in the Sīhalamātikāṭṭhakathā. But in the Samantapāsādikā an investigation of this [meaning] is carried through.”

According to Kkh-nṭ the investigation carried through by Sp is to be found in Sp IV 904,29–905,2. Kkh-nṭ 453,25–454,6: *lokassādamittasantha-vavasenā ti* (Kkh 283,14) *lokassādasanākhātassa mittasanthavassa vasena. kiñ tan ti āha kāyasamsaggarāgenā ti* (Kkh 283,14f.) *kāyasamsaggarāgen'* eva *tintā idha avassutā nāma. na methunarāgenā ti. katham etam viññāyatā ti āha ayam eva hī ti* (Kkh 283,15) *ādi. kiñ pan' ettha kāraṇan ti āha Samantapāsādikāyam panassa vicāraṇā katā ti* (Kkh 283,16). *tatthāyam vicāraṇā: ettha ca asaddhammo ti* (Vin III 28,8) *kāyasamsaggo va veditabbo. na methunadhammo. na hi methunassa sāmantā thullaccayam hoti. viññū patibalo kāyasamsaggaṇi samāpajitun ti* (Vin IV 214,17, 221,9) *vacanam pi c' ettha sādhakan ti* (Sp IV 904,29–905,2) “**By virtue of worldly pleasures such as intimacy with friends** means: By virtue of intimacy with friends called ‘worldly pleasures’. [To show] why that [is, the Kkh author] says: **by virtue of desire for bodily contact. [She is] wet** only by virtue of desire for bodily contact, does here mean [she is] **overflowing** [only by virtue of desire for bodily contact] not by virtue of desire for sexual intercourse. [To show] how this becomes visible, [the Kkh author] says: **For only this**, etc. [To show] what is the reason in this connection, [the Kkh author] says: **But in the Samantapāsādikā an investigation of this [meaning] has been carried through.** There (i.e. in Sp) the [following] is the investigation: “And in this connection ‘[what is] not verily dhamma’ is to be understood only as desire for bodily contact, not as sexual intercourse. For there is no grave offence

that he looked into some older sources in addition to Sp. But the extent to which he actually borrowed text from them cannot be said.

6. ARRANGEMENT OF THE TEXT AND PARALLELS IN SP

As a commentary on the two Pātimokkhas, the structure of the text is predetermined. It comments on the Bhikkhu Pātimokha, followed by the Bhikkhunī Pātimokha. Both sections are divided into chapters named according to the offences dealt with in them, the Bhikkhu Pātimokha into eight,¹ the Bhikkhunī Pātimokha into seven sections — all the sections for bhikkhus except the *Aniyata* section.

The commentary opens with six śloka stanzas (*ganthārambhakathā*), and concludes with a colophon (*nigamana*) of seven śloka stanzas (see above, pp. xviiiff.). In some manuscripts and editions of Kkh the so-called Buddhaghosa colophon is added at the end.² After the opening stanzas and before the actual commentary on the Bhikkhu Pātimokha there follows a commentary on the introduction (*nidāna*) handed down together with the separately transmitted Pātimokha only.³ The commentator uses this portion to include many subjects which are highly important for the communities' daily practice. These are discussed in the Vinaya and its commentary in the Khandhaka sections, for which there is no parallel in the Pātimokkhas, and consequently in Kkh.

The Kkh author, who used Sp as his main source but who also looked up at least one older source, presents topics discussed in Sp in the commentary on the Khandhakas in his commentary on the introduction, thus creating a concise handbook for the communal life of the Saṅgha. Among these topics are, for instance, the regulations on the monastic boundary (*sīmā*, Kkh 6,20–13,2), on the observance (*uposatha*)

connected with sexual intercourse. And the [following] statement too is effecting [this] in this connection: **he is learned, competent to come into physical contact.**"

¹ *Pārājika, Saṅghādisesa, Aniyata, Nissaggiya, Nissaggiya-Pācittiya, Pāṭidesanīya, Sekhiya, Adhikaraṇa.*

² Kkh 375,1–15; see also von Hinüber 1995b: 132; von Hinüber 1996a: § 221;

³ That means that the Pātimokha which was handed down independently of the Vinaya, had an own introduction. As stated by von Hinüber 1996a: § 222, the introduction handed down in the Vinaya is different from that.

Translators' Introduction

xxxiii

and the invitation (*pavāraṇā*, Kkh 4,25ff.), and on shared offences (*sabhāgāpatti*, Kkh 13,3ff.), etc.

In one case, an important section on probation (*parivāsa*) and the *mānatta* period — the two penalties relevant for Saṅghādisesa offences — is found in the concluding passage of the Saṅghādisesa section. It has parallels in the Sp commentary on the concluding passage of the Saṅghādisesa section and, for a larger part, in the Sp commentary on the Cullavagga, on which it is mainly based, and to which Kkh refers for a more detailed discussion.¹

Furthermore, there are five instances where longer portions from Sp are found in Kkh in the commentary on specific rules:

(1) In Pār 1 M passages on full ordination (*upasampadā*) and the indisputable nature of the ordination procedure, presented in connection with the explanation of the word *bhikkhu*, have parallels in the Sp commentary on the first Pārājika, and on the Mahāvagga.²

(2) In connection with Niss 3 M, the eight channels through which robes may accrue are discussed; there are parallels for these in the Sp commentary on the Mahāvagga.³

(3) In Pāc 59 M the explanation of the two types of *vikappana* has a parallel in the Sp commentary on Niss 1 M.⁴

(4) In Pāc 79 M a section discussing the various types of procedures (*kamma*), and the matters to which they are applied, has a parallel in the Sp commentary on the Parivāra.⁵

(5) In Pāc 81 M in explaining what heavy goods (*garubhanda*) are, and what they are not, a very long section with a parallel in the Sp

¹ Kkh 82,17–88,3 corresponds to Sp III 629,18–24; and to various passages between Sp VI 1174,1–84,7. Details will be included in the complete list of parallels added to the second volume.

² Kkh 28,19–31,30; parallels are found in the Sp commentary on the first Pārājika rule (Sp I 241,10–14) and on the Mahāvagga (Sp V 1016,26–17,10; 1024,8–19).

³ Kkh 102,12–21 = Sp V 1136,8–19; Kkh 103,1–5 = Sp V 1136,27–33; in the further pages between Kkh 103,5 and 106,6 there are lots of parallels between Sp V 1136,33 and 1145,20. A complete list of the parallels between both texts will be added to the second volume.

⁴ Kkh 209,10–10,15 = Sp III 648,3–49,8, see below, pp. 415ff.

⁵ Kkh 228,4–29,9 = Sp VII 1409,26–11,6; Kkh 229,20–30,20 = Sp VII 1411,24–12,12; Kkh 230,20–31,3 = Sp VII 1395,31–96,2.

commentary on the Cullavagga lists objects and material from everyday life.¹

It is possible that the Kkh author transferred these various passages from the Sp commentary on other Pātimokkha rules, the Khandhakas, and the Parivāra to the respective positions in Kkh. Von Hinüber, however, assumes for at least one passage discussed above (p. xxx) that Kkh preserves the original order of the comments of the old commentaries, and that Sp shifted them to the Khandhaka section (1996: § 225).

7. NAMES OF CHAPTERS (*VAGGA*)

In the eight sections of the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha, the thirty Nissaggiya, the ninety-two Pācittiya, and the seventy-five Sekhiya rules are further subdivided into chapters (*vagga*) which normally contain ten rules. The penultimate section of the Pācittiyas has twelve. In the Sekhiya section a similar arrangement is found, but it seems to have been introduced only later, since in Kkh they are arranged in three sections with a different number of rules (see below 7.3).

7.1 NISSAGGIYA-PĀCITTIYA

In Kkh C^e E^e the Nissaggiya-Pācittiya group contains three chapters with ten rules each, called *cīvara-*, *elakaloma-*, and *patta-vagga*.² This also is the arrangement in Pāt 1939, where the sections are numbered as well. In two other Pātimokkha editions, of which the older goes back to the Siamese tradition (Pāt 1966; Pāt 2008), the second chapter is named *kosiya-vagga*. In Pāt, the first two chapters bear the names *kathina-* and *kosiya-vagga*. For the *kathina-vagga* the editors thus follow the Burmese as opposed to the Siamese tradition (*cīvara-vagga*), and with the name *kosiya-* instead of *elakaloma-vagga*, they follow the Siamese tradition. Other traditions do not present a name. Finally, in Sp E^e these same sections are called *cīvara-*, *elakaloma-*, and *tatiyavagga*, showing a mixture of names based on rules' names and on numbering chapters. Sp C^e S^e only number the chapters; Sp B^e N^e offer *cīvara-*, *kosiya-*, and *patta-vagga* as we find in Siamese editions of the Pātimokkha. Thus there seem to be differences concerning the naming of the chapters in

¹ Kkh 233,19–38,4 = Sp VI 1240,10–45,17.

² So also the titles in Vin-vn E^e 40,23, 49,1 53,17.

Translators' Introduction

xxxv

the various Theravāda countries' traditions, and between the Vinaya (Sp) and the Pātimokkha (Kkh) transmission.

7.2. PĀCITTIYA

In the Pācittiya section the second subchapter is called *bhūtagāma-vagga* in the various Pātimokkha editions (Pāt; Pāt 1939; Pāt 1966; Pāt 2008), as well as in Kkh C^e E^e. In Sp E^e (IV 759,21, 786,20) C^e S^e it is called *senāsana-vagga*.¹ Since in Sp the name of the chapter is not only handed down as a subheading but also in the text at the beginning of the chapter, the name *senāsana-vagga* is clear from the text itself. When in Sp B^e this chapter receives the heading *bhūtagāma-vagga*, as in the Pātimokkha-Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī transmission, this stands in clear contradiction to the text itself.

The third section is called *ovāda-vagga* in Pāt and in the Siamese edition by Nāṇamoli (Pāt 1966: 53). In other editions we find instead *bhikkhunovāda-vagga* (Pāt 1939; Pāt 2008). This section goes under the name *bhikkhunī-vagga* in the Samantapāśādikā (Sp E^e IV 786,21, C^e, S^e),² whereas Sp B^e again follows the Pātimokkha-Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī transmission. *Ovāda-vagga* as well as *bhikkhunī-vagga* are certainly only different short titles for *bhikkhunovāda-vagga*.

The ninth section is called *rāja-vagga* in Sp C^e E^e S^e,³ against *ratana-vagga* in Sp B^e; the reading of the Burmese tradition goes again with that of the Pātimokkha-Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī transmission.

7.3. SEKHIYA

In the various Pātimokkha editions (Pāt, Pāt 1939, Pāt 2008), in Oldenberg's Vinaya edition (Vin), and in Sp, the Sekhiya section is separated into seven sections (*vagga*): six sections with ten rules each, and a seventh comprising the final fifteen rules. These *vaggas* are each named after the first rule, and are, in addition, numbered from one to seven in the Vinaya (Vin IV 187, 188, 191, 194, 197, 201, 206), and in most Pātimokkha editions (Pāt; Pāt 2008). Sp only gives numerical titles (*pāthamo* to *sattamo vaggo*). The Pātimokkha edition by Vadekar

¹ So also in Vin-vn E^e 71,15, 80,6.

² Vin-vn E^e 80,7, 85,9 *Bhikkhunī-vagga*; *Ovāda-vagga* is added by the editor in round brackets (80,8).

³ So also Vin-vn E^e 124,23, 128,21.

(Pāt 1939) mixes both, giving — in square brackets — the title as well as the numerical indication for chapters one to four (for chapter three he mentions *na-kambhaka-vaggo* instead of *kambhakata-vaggo*), but he only gives the numerical title for the remaining chapters.

Kkh and its new commentary (Kkh-nt) — the old one does not discuss the Sekhiya section — do not reflect this division. Here, the seventy-five rules are divided into three sections:

1. twenty-six rules on proper behaviour (*chabbisati sāruppa-sikkhā-pada-vanñanā*; rules 1–26),
2. thirty rules on food (*timsa bhojana-ppatisamyutta-sikkhāpada-vanñanā*; rules 27–56), and
3. nineteen rules concerning teaching the Doctrine (*ekūnavisati dhamma-desanā-paṭisamyutta-sikkhāpada-vanñanā*; rules 57–75).

In the last section, the rules connected with teaching the Doctrine actually end with Sekh 72. Thus 73 to 75 from the point of view of content do not belong to this section. This, however, is not reflected in Kkh. In the Siamese tradition (Mahā-nikāya as well as Dhammayuttika-nikāya),¹ a division into four parts is to be traced (in BudSir this is supplemented by the division into seven sections with titles and numbers). The arrangement agrees with that of Kkh, with the difference that the latter's third section is split into two, namely into the

1. *solasa dhammadesanāpaṭisamyuttā [dhammā]* (rules 57–72) and
2. *tayo pakinnakā [dhammā]* (73–75).

That this split of the Kkh's third *vagga* into two is not ancient is obvious from the numbering of the rules in the Siamese edition. Whereas in each of the first three *vaggas* the numbering of the rules begins with one, this is not the case in the fourth *vagga*. It begins with sixteen and ends with nineteen, clearly continuing the numbering of the third *vagga*. This shows that the detachment of the final three rules from the third *vagga*, and the creation of a fourth *vagga* (*pakiññaka vagga*) was a subsequent adjustment to the different content of these rules.

¹ Pāt 1966; Pātimokha in BudSir; Vajirañānavarorasa 1969: 204–25; Thānissaro 2007: I 524.

A comparison of the arrangement of these rules in other Buddhist schools' Vinayas would be worth investigating. The Sarvāstivāda Pātimokkha, for instance, arranges the Śaikṣa rules in four sections which to a large degree correspond to those of the Theravādin in Kkh (PrMoSū(Sa): 240–55).

8. NAMES OF THE RULES

8.1. SUPPOSED DIVERGENCES BETWEEN THE NAMES OF RULES IN KKH AND SP

With respect to the third Pārājika, von Hinüber (1996: § 223) states that this rule is called *manussa-viggaha* in Vin II 286,³⁷ and Sp IV 768,²², but *jīvita-voropana-vatthu* (sic) in Kkh (E^e 1981: 32,¹⁹). In fact, the third Pārājika for monks bears the name *manussa-viggaha-sikkhāpada* in Vin, Sp, and Pāt; in other Pātimokkha editions the Pārājika rules are merely numbered (Pāt 1939; Pāt 1966).¹ In Kkh the rule is introduced as “the third Pārājika” (*tatiya-pārājika*). Kkh, in the classification of each rule as a third category, mentions the subject matter of the respective rule which is expressed by the term *vatthu*. The subject matter normally is formulated by nominalizing a relevant verbal sequence from the rule to form the first member of a compound ending in °*vatthu*. In the case of Pār 3 M the sequence of the rule *jīvitā voropeyya* (Kkh 48,¹³) has been nominalized as *aññamaññam jīvitā voropana-vatthu* (Kkh 51,^{19f}).² This, however, is not the rule's name. For that, Kkh also uses *manussa-viggaha*, as is proved by a cross-reference from Pāc 61 M (Kkh 212,¹²) to Pār 3 M with the words *sesam manussavigghe vuttanayam evā ti* (“The remainder is exactly of the manner stated in respect of [the rule about] a human being”).

According to von Hinüber, “*aññātakaviññatti-sikkhāpada*, Kkh 77,²¹, can only refer to Sp 667,²², but not to the corresponding rule in Kkh

¹ This also holds true for Vin-vn.

² In Sp II 435,^{16f} we find a similar statement *tasmā ... pārājikassa vatthu-bhūtam aññamaññam jīvitā voropanam eva gahetvā pārājikam paññapento*. “.... therefore ... having accepted only the depriving one another of life as the subject matter of [this] Pārājika, he prescribes [this] Pārājika.” Similarly this is expressed in Pāc 61 M (Kkh 212,^{8f}. *pāññam jīvitā voropanavatthusmim paññattam*; below, p. 421).

named *cīvara-viññāpana-vatthu*, Kkh 64,30.”¹ Here, exactly the same is valid as in Pār 3 M. *Cīvara-viññāpana-vatthu* (Kkh 110,24) is the “subject matter” given in the classification of Niss 6 M. It is a nominalized clause from *cīvaraṇi viññāpeyya* (rule; Kkh 110,11f.). The name of the rule is independent of that. This is proved by the passage referred to by von Hinüber (Kkh E^e 1981: 77,21 = Kkh E^c 2003: 133,19) which cross-references — within Kkh — from Niss 24 M to Niss 6 M.² Niss 6 M is called *aññātaka-viññatti-sikkhāpada* in Kkh (110,10; 111,7) just as in Sp (III 668,17f.).³ Thus, at least these two divergences between Vin/Sp and Kkh do not exist.⁴

8.2. SOME DIVERGENCES BETWEEN THE NAMES OF THE RULES IN KKH AND SP

8.2.1. SGH 9 M

Sgh 9 M is called *dutiya-duṭṭha-dosa-sikkhāpada* (“the second rule of training [about] wicked, evil intention”) in Sp III 602,22, while Sgh 8 M was the *paṭhama-duṭṭha-dosa-sikkhāpada* (Sp III 598,10). For both rules the titles are not only given as sub-headings, but in the text itself. In that connection Sgh 8 M is simply called *duṭṭha-dosa-sikkhāpada* (Sp III 575,21), without the specification *pathama*.⁵ But in the case of Sgh 9 M, the rule is named *dutiya-duṭṭha-dosa-sikkhāpada* in the text (Sp III 598,11).⁶ In some Pātimokkha editions the Saṅghādisesa rules do not have names (Pāt 1939; Pāt 1966). In Pāt and Pāt 2008, Sgh 8 M is called *duṭṭha-dosa-sikkhāpada*, and Sgh 9 M *añña-bhāgiya-sikkhāpada* (“The rule about belonging to another category”; Pāt). These are also the names given in Kkh (73,24; 75,14; see below, pp. 156, 160). Since

¹ The Kkh references by von Hinüber refer to Kkh E^e 1981.

² Kkh 133,18–20: *yathā vā tathā vā “detha me” ti ādivacanena viññāpentassa aññātakaviññattisikkhāpadena nissaggiyam pācittiyam*. “For one asking in some way or other with such words as ‘Give me’, there is [an offence entailing] expiation with forfeiture according to the rule of training about ‘asking a non-relative’ (Niss 6 M).”

³ Also in Vin-vn E^e 46,22. A second cross-reference goes from Kkh 134,15 to Niss 6 M.

⁴ For further information on other names of rules, see von Hinüber 1999: 9, n. 27.

⁵ So also in Vin-vn E^e 30,31.

⁶ So also in Vin-vn E^e 31,5.

Kkh is younger than Sp, this change of name must have been deliberately made, possibly in order to avoid the numbering of the two rules bearing otherwise identical names. The nomenclature of Kkh is taken over also in the commentaries to the Khuddasikkhā and Mūlasikkhā,¹ but otherwise appears only once, namely in the oldest Vinaya subcommentary.²

8.2.2. NISS 4 M

Niss 4 M is called *purāṇa-cīvara-sikkhāpada* in Sp (III 659,24; 662,21f.), Kkh (107,10; 109,2), Pāt and Pāt 2008. Otherwise the rules are simply numbered in the Pātimokkha editions (Pāt 1939; Pāt 1966) and also in Kkh C^e. In five cross references to Niss 4 M,³ the name used to refer to Niss 4 M is *dhvovāpana-sikkhāpada* (“the rule of training about causing to be washed”). A single cross reference to Niss 4 M, this time from Niss 17 M (Kkh 123,24), refers to it as *purāṇa-cīvara-dhvovāpana* (“[the rule about] having an old robe washed”).⁴ Here the name of the rule clearly appears in the first two words, and, in addition, there is the *dhvovāpana* of the five other cross references. Actually, in the case of Niss 4 M, the subject matter is formulated as *purāṇa-cīvara-dhvovāpana-vatthu* (Kkh 108,8f.) for *purāṇacīvaraṃ dhvovāpeyya* (rule; Kkh 107,11f.). The reason for this more detailed reference in Niss 17 M is certainly that Niss 17 M also is a *dhvovāpana*-rule, namely the *elakaloma-dhvovāpana-sikkhāpada*. Thus all *dhvovāpana* references could go either to Niss 4 M or to Niss 17 M. Since, however, the author of Kkh in Niss 17 M refers to Niss 4 M for the classification of the rule, the assumption that the reference goes to Niss 4 M is more plausible. The creation of the title *purāṇa-cīvara-dhvovāpana-sikkhāpada*,⁵ is directly based on the formulation of the subject matter.

¹ Khuddas-pṭ 82,4 (ad Khuddas v. 27); Mūlas-t 472,15 (Mūlas v. 16).

² Vjb 80,4.

³ From Niss 11 M (Kkh 120,8), Niss 22 M (Kkh 131,3), Niss 24 M (Kkh 135,3), Niss 26 M (Kkh 137,2), and Niss 27 M (Kkh 138,17).

⁴ In the parallel in Sp III 689,16, the reference is formulated in the locative *purāṇa-cīvara-sikkhāpade*.

⁵ It appears once in Vmv I 335,21. And in Vin-vn E^e 45,33, it is called *purāṇa-cīvara-dhvovāpana-kathā*.

x1

Overcoming Doubts

8.2.3. NISS 29 M

Niss 29 M is called *sāsaṅka-sikkhāpada* (“the rule about dangerous”) in Sp (III 730,1; 732,15f.), Kkh (E^e 141,14; Kkh B^e), Pāt, and Pāt 2008.¹ In other editions of the Pātimokkha the rules are merely numbered, as they are in Kkh C^e. In Pāt 4 M the Kkh author refers to Niss 29 M using the name *cīvara-vippavāsa-sikkhāpada* (“the rule of training about dwelling away from the robes”, Kkh 250,13f.). This designation obviously has been deduced from the subject matter of the rule which is expressed by *cīvara-vippavāsa-vatthu* (Kkh 141,11). This name does not appear elsewhere.

The rule is, in addition, referred to as *āraññakasikkhāpada* (Sp II 301,13; IV 919,17f.;² Kkh-pṭ 71,24 (in a quotation from Vajirabuddhi’s Anuganṭhipada),³ Vibh-mūla-ṭ 183, Vism-mhṭ I 97, Sv-nṭ II 122), which might have been so, because it is quoted in connection with a definition of *arañña*.

8.2.4. PĀC 20 M

Pāc 20 M bears the name *sappāṇaka-sikkhāpada* in Sp (IV 785,31, 786,19), Kkh (165,22, 166,21), Pāt, and Pāt 2008.⁴ Pāc 62 M bears the same name in Sp IV 865,25f., Kkh 212,14, 23, Pāt, and Pāt 2008. In the classification of Pāc 62 M, Kkh (212,21) makes a cross reference to Pāc 20 M with the title *siñcana-sikkhāpada* (“the rule of training about pouring”), which may be based on the subject matter of Pāc 20 M, expressed by *siñcana-vatthu* (Kkh 166,11). The fact that the difference between these two rules is discussed in the commentarial literature using *siñcana-sikkhāpada* for Pāc 20 M and *sappāṇaka-sikkhāpada* for Pāc 62 M, clearly shows that *siñcana-sikkhāpada* was the original name of Pāc 20 M.⁵ This would be similar to Pāc 79 M; see below 8.2.6.

¹ Also in Vin-vn E^e 63,5.

² For the latter passage see the translation in Kieffer-Pülz 2016b: 72, n. 59.

³ This belongs to the Anuganṭhipada quotations in Kkh-pṭ not shared with Vjb and not yet examined (see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I A n. 116).

⁴ Also in Vin-vn E^e 80,5.

⁵ Sp-ṭ III 83,13 (Pāc 62 M), for the constituent factors of this rule, makes reference to the *siñcana-sikkhāpada*. Vin-vn-ṭ I 540,4ff., discusses the difference between these two rules, also calling them *siñcana-* and *sappāṇaka-sikkhāpada*.

Translators' Introduction

xli

8.2.5. PĀC 67 M

Pāc 67 M bears the title *saṃvidhāna-sikkhāpada* (“rule about arrangements”) in Sp (IV 869,6), Kkh (216,13, 21), Pāt, and Pāt 2008.¹ Actually, it is the rule concerning an appointment with any woman (*mātugāma*). There exists a second rule with the same title (*saṃvidhāna-sikkhāpada*), namely Pāc 27 M. The difference is that Pāc 27 M regulates appointments with bhikkhunīs, Pāc 67 M with non-monastic women. In the frame of Pāc 27 M the Kkh author states that appointments with “nuns” ordained only by one side (i.e. only by the side of the bhikkhunīs) are an offence according to the *mātugāma-sikkhāpada* (Kkh 172,11). This refers to Pāc 67 M. The name *mātugāma-sikkhāpada* for this rule is explained in Kkh-nṭ (377,if.) as referring to the seventh rule in the *sappāṇaka-vagga*. Possibly this name was not so generally used that it needed to be explained. But *mātugāma-sikkhāpada* is further used for cross references in two of the Tīkās on the Vinaya.² The subject matter of this rule can only conditionally have served as a model (*mātugāmena saddhim ekaddhānamaggam patipajjanavatthu*, Kkh 216,17f.), but in this case, the difference between *mātugāma* and *bhikkhunī* was clearly the decisive factor.

8.2.6. PĀC 79 M

Pāc 79 M is called *kamma-paṭibāhana-sikkhāpada* in Sp (IV 879,26f.), Kkh (226,15, 231,19), Pāt, and Pāt 2008.³ The subject matter is expressed by *khīyanā-dhammāpajjana-vatthu* (Kkh 231,10f.) from the verbal expression in the rule (Kkh 226,17: *khīyanadhammam āpajjeyya*). Von Hinüber (1999: 62) assumes that this rule was originally named *khīyanaka*, referring to the mention of a *khīyanakam pācittiyam* in the Cullavagga (Vin II 94.8, 14; 95.24; 97.37f.; etc.). Though this holds true from the point of view of content, there are no further traces of this old name of Pāc 79 M. But it is striking that the *ukkoṭanakam pācittiyam* mentioned in the same context (Vin II 94.7, etc.), which refers to Pāc 63 M (subject matter: *ukkoṭana-vatthu*), still bears the name *ukkoṭana-sikkhāpada* in the subheadings of the various commentaries.

¹ Also in Vin-vn E^e 118,33.

² Sp-t III 51,3, Vmv II 24,28 (... *mātugāmasikkhāpadena āpatti*).

³ Also in Vin-vn E^e 123,25 read °bhāhana° for °bhāhāna°.

8.2.7. PĀC 89 M

Pāc 89 M is called *nisīdana-sikkhāpada* in Sp (IV 884,20), Kkh (245,8,24), Pāt and Pāt 2008.¹ Niss 15 M is called *nisīdana-sikkhāpada* too in the Kañkhāvitaranī (Kkh 122,1,17), but *nisīdana-santhata-sikkhāpada* in Pātimokkha and Samantapāsādikā (Pāt 36,21; Pāt 2008: 36; Sp III 685,20). Since in the rule itself (Niss 15 M) the subject is called *nisīdana-santhata*, and since otherwise two rules would bear the same name, it is probable that Niss 15 M was originally called *nisīdana-santhata-sikkhāpada*.

8.2.8. SEKH 36

Sekh 36 is called *sūpa-vyañjana-ppaṭicchādāna[-sikkhāpada]* in Sp (IV 898,34), but *odana-ppaṭicchādāna-sikkhāpada* in Pāt, Pāt 2008, and in Kkh (261,8)². In the name chosen in Sp the indication of the meals covered is taken from the rule, whereas in the name of Kkh the meal with which they are covered is used. Thus, from the point of view of content, both are possible. Nevertheless, it is obvious that the Pātimokkha-Kañkhāvitaranī transmission goes a different way here.

Concerning the section on bhikkhunīs, the details will be given in the second volume.

9. CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

9.1. GENERAL STATEMENT

The author of Kkh classifies most rules following a catalogue of seventeen categories.³ This classification is very clear and concise and concludes the commentary on each of the Pātimokkha rules:

- (1) provenance (*nidāna*)
- (2) individual (*puggala*)
- (3) subject matter (*vatthu*)
- (4) types of prescription (*paññatti*)
- (5) command (*āṇatta*)
- (6) [sorts of] offence (*āpatti*)

¹ Also in Vin-vn E^e 128,3.

² Also in Kkh-nṭ 441,12, 16.

³ In the case of the seventy-five Sekhiyas he summarizes the classification in the beginning (Kkh 253,22–54,3) and the end (Kkh 271,16–72,8), and only lists the classifications specific to a rule at the end of the respective rules.

Translators' Introduction

xliii

- (7) non-offence (*anāpatti*)
- (8) failure (*vipatti*)
- (9) constituent factors (*aṅga*)
- (10) [sorts of] origin (*samuṭṭhāna*)
- (11) activity (*kiriyā*)
- (12) awareness (*saññā*)
- (13) intention (*citta*)
- (14) faults (*vajja*)
- (15) deeds (*kamma*)
- (16) triad of thought (*citta*)
- (17) triad of feelings (*vedanā*)

The fourth and fifth categories (= 4. *prescription*; = 5. *command*) are listed up to Pāṭ 1 M. There, the Kkh author explains that Pāṭ 1 M is a rule exclusive to bhikkhus (4. *prescription* = *paññatti*) and that it is not connected with commanding someone else (5. *command* = *āṇattika*). Subsequently, he states that this is valid also for the remaining rules. Because of that he does not mention these classifications in the subsequent rules. But since for some Pātimokkha rules there exist supplementary rules (*anupaññatti*), and since this information is also given in the fourth category, this category is listed in the classification of Pāṭ 3 and 4 M, which both have supplementary rules. The information that these rules are exclusive to bhikkhus, however, is not repeated. The fifth category does not appear in the classifications of the remaining Pāti-desanya rules.

The sixth category (= 6. [sorts of] offences) lists the various types of offences that might occur with a transgression of the rules. Up to Niss 4 M Kkh informs the reader about the various degrees of offences that may come up in connection with this rule in a style similar to the casuistries of the Vinaya. But from Niss 4 M onwards he simply states “[It is a] triple [offence entailing] expiation” (*tika-pācittiyan*).¹ Accordingly, the cases are no longer described in the classifications of the subsequent rules but only hinted at by the term *tika-pācittiyan*. This is valid for the Nissaggiya-Pācittiya category as well as for the Pācittiya

¹ Kkh 108,21f.: *ito param pana evarūpesu thānesu tikapācittiyan ti vakkhāma.*

section, where we only find the term *tika-pācittiyyam*.¹ In the Pāṭidesanīya section the author instead says *tika-pāṭidesanīyam*,² without introducing that expression separately. In all instances we refer to the relevant cases described in the Vinaya by giving the respective references in the notes.

The eighth category (= 8. *failure*) is only listed up to Niss 1 M. There the author informs the reader that the Pārajika and Saṅghādisesa rules all count as failures in virtuous conduct (*sīla-vipatti*), whereas all rules from Niss 1 M onwards count as failures in right behaviour (*ācāra-vipatti*, Kkh 99,12f).³

The classification does not come out of the blue. The Parivāra in the first part of its first chapter (P I.1) for each Pātimokkha rule of the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha asks the question where the rule has been prescribed (= 1. *provenance*), with respect to whom (= 2. *individual*), and with respect to which subject matter (= 3. *subject matter*). It states how many prescriptions (*paññatti*) and supplementary prescriptions (*anupaññatti*) there are in one rule (= 4. *paññatti*). This covers the first four categories of Kkh's classification system. Thereafter the Parivāra jumps to the tenth category, namely the types of origins (= 10. *saṃutthāna*) by which an offence originates (Vin V 1,1–33,10). In the second part of this chapter the Parivāra asks which offences may arise in the case of each Pātimokkha rule (Vin V 33,11–46,22). Though the formulation does not correspond to that of the respective sections in Kkh, its topic equals Kkh's sixth category (= 6. [sorts of] offence). The third section of this Parivāra chapter (P I.3) asks which kind of failure is associated with a transgression of the rule (Vin V 46,23–31) and corresponds to the eighth category of the above list. P I.4 deals with the questions about which types of offences are possible in the case of the transgression of a rule. This, from the point of view of content, can be seen as included in category six (= 6. [sorts of] offence). P I.5 then takes up the origination of an offence and repeats the respective section of P

¹ See Kkh Index of Words s.v.

² Kkh 247,19; 248,18; 249,19; 251,5.

³ Kkh 99,17f.: *iti vipattikathā idh' eva niṭhitā ti, na nam ito param vicārayi-ssāma.* “Thus discussion about failures is finished just here. We shall not examine it after this.”

Translators' Introduction

xlv

I.1. P I.8 repeats P I.2. P I.9 then repeats the provenance section from P I.1; P I.10 is related to P I.4; P I.11 repeats P I.3; etc. P II contains a similar section for bhikkhunīs. P III then contains a *samuṭṭhāna* chapter which represents a more developed stage, and also contains the key words for the thirteen origination, that are used in Kkh.¹

From the seventeen categories listed above, categories, 1–4, 6, 8, and 10 are thus discussed already in the Parivāra.

That the classification system of Sp — given at the end of most rules² — is not as clearly structured as the one in Kkh was noted earlier (von Hinüber 1992a: 65f.). In Sp it regularly reaches from the tenth to the seventeenth category. Thus the categories not necessarily listed are 5 (command), and 7 (non-offence). Category 9 (constituent factors), the classification category mentioning the constituent factors (*aṅgas*) which are required to judge a behaviour as a transgression of a rule, is not found in Sp. That they were considered important is clearly seen from the fact that the respective sentences of Kkh have been borrowed verbatim by several of the subcommentaries.³

¹ The relation of the various Parivāra chapters are discussed in von Hinüber 1992a: 65.

² As an alternative to the individual classification, Sp provides summarizing classifications which stand at the end of an entire offence category. This is valid, for instance, in the case of the Pācittiyas for bhikkhunīs (Sp IV 948,3ff.).

³ Mūlas-t, Sp-t, Vmv.

9.2. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE TERMINOLOGY IN KKH AND SP

		<i>The 13 keywords for origination (samuṭṭhāna)</i>	
		<i>Kkh, Parivāra (Vin V 89)</i>	<i>deviating names in Sp</i>
1		paṭhama-pārājika	
2		adinnādāna ¹	ti-samuṭṭhāna
3		sañcaritta	cha-samuṭṭhāna
4	M	samanubhāsana	samanubhāsana dhuranikkhepa
5	M	kaṭhina	
6	M	eḷakaloma	
7		padaso-dhamma	
8	M	addhāna	catu-samuṭṭhāna
9	M	theyya-sattha	
10		dhamma-desana	
11		bhūtārocana	
12		corī-vuṭṭhāpana	
13	M	anunuññāta	

Despite the fact that Kkh gives *sañcaritta-samuṭṭhāna* as the keyword (3) for an offence that arises from six origins,² its author, in addition to this used the same key word as the Sp author (*cha-samuṭṭhānam*) in the first rule where it appears, i.e. in the *sañcaritta* rule (Kkh 65,¹² [Sgh 5 M]), and in the subsequent rule (Kkh 69,³). Thus a comparison of Kkh and Sp concerning the application of the terminology in the *samuṭṭhāna* system needs investigation.

¹ Vin V 87,²⁵ calls this *dutiyapārājika-samuṭṭhāna*.

² Kkh 37,4f.: *yā chahi pi samuṭṭhāti, ayam sañcarittasamuṭṭhānā nāma*. “Whatever [offence] originates because of all six [origins], this is called “[an offence] having the origin of the [rule about] a go-between.”

Translators' Introduction

xlvii

19.3. DEVIATIONS IN THE CLASSIFICATIONS OF KKH AND SP

According to the summarizing statement of Kkh at the end of the Sekhiya section, Sekh I shares the classification of Pārājika I from the tenth category onwards. That means Sekh I would be classified as originating from activity (= 11. *activity*), [having] acquittal due to [lacking] awareness (*saññāvimokkha*) (= 12. *awareness*), [being dependent on] intention (*sacittaka*) (= 13. *intention*), being [a] fault according to common opinion (*lokavajja*) (= 14. *fault*), [being] a physical deed (*kāyakamma*) (= 15. *deed*), [being done with an] unwholesome [type of] thought (*akusalacitta*) (= 16. *thought*), and [with] two [types of] feeling (= 17. *feelings*). Sp gives this classification (Sp IV 890,9 with n. 3), except for the last category where it does not mention two types of feeling but only “unpleasant feeling” (*dukkha-vedanā*). In addition, Sp IV 890,10–12 gives two further classifications for this rule: namely, that of the Vinaya specialist, Elder Phussadeva¹: “dependent on intention” (*sacittaka*, 13.), “a fault according to a precept [laid down by the Buddha]” (*pannattivajja*, 14.); “[with] three [types of] feeling” (*ti-vedanā*, 17.); and that of the Vinaya specialist Elder Upatissa² (“a fault according to common opinion” (*loka-vajja*, 14); “[an] unwholesome [type of] thought” (*akusala-citta*, 16), and “an unpleasant feeling” (*dukkha-vedanā*, 17). It is obvious that Sp, and Kkh largely, follow the classification of the Elder Upatissa. The different classifications of Sekh I continued to exist through the centuries. The South Indian Vinaya commentary *Vimatativinodanīṭikā* (twelfth/thirteenth century CE) follows the classification of Thera Phussadeva.³

¹ Phussadeva Thera was a Vinaya expert of the first century BCE; see Mori 1989: 66, no. 86; Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 175f.

² Upatissa Thera was also a Vinaya expert, a contemporary of Phussadeva Thera; see Mori 1989: 61 no. 75; Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 176f.

³ For details, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 246].

	Phussadeva	Upatissa	Sp	Kkh
10			paṭhamapārājika	paṭhamapārājika
11			kiriyā	kiriyā
12			saññāvimokkham	saññāvimokkham
13	sacittakam		sacittakam	sacittakam
14	paññattivajjam	lokavajjam	lokavajjam	lokavajjam
15			kāyakammam	kāyakammam
16		akusalacittam	akusalacittam	akusalacittam
17	ti-vedanā	dukkha-vedanā	dukkha-vedanā	dukkha-vedanā

But Kkh and Sp differ concerning the last category, where Kkh by the reference to the first Pārājika (Kkh 272,8 to Kkh 40,15ff.) accepts two types of feelings, namely an unpleasant and indifferent type of feeling (Kkh 39, below, p. 85) for Sekh 1 contrary to Sp and Upatissa, which exclusively teach unpleasant feeling.

A similar divergence in the classification can also be observed in the eighth Pārājika for nuns, where Kkh teaches *dvivedanam* (Kkh 285,2) against *tivedanam* of Sp (IV 906,7).

A thorough comparison of the classifications of Sp and Kkh is a desideratum.

9.4. FAULTS IN THE CLASSIFICATION

In the classification of Niss 29 M the author of Kkh, after the first three categories of the classification (provenance, individuals, subject matter), refers for the remaining classification to Niss 2 M.¹ Since Niss 2 M according to the fourth category (prescription) is a rule in common for bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs (*sādharaṇā-paññatti*), this would make Niss

¹ Kkh 141,12f.(below, p. 277) *sesam ettha cīvaravaggassa dutiyasikkhāpade vuttanayen’ eva veditabban ti*. “The remainder here is to be understood exactly in the manner stated in the second rule of training of the Robe section.”

Translators' Introduction

xlix

| 29 N a *sādhāraṇā-paññatti* too. However, Niss 29 M is exclusive to
| bhikkhus, since bhikkhunīs are not allowed to live in the wilderness.¹

| 10. GUIDELINES

| Unlike the author of Sp, the author of Kkh does not state that he is
| writing a “a commentary on words not [explained] before” (*apubba-*
| *pada-vanṇanā*, Sp III 517,6). Instead he makes ample use of internal
| directives at different points in the text concerning the structure of his
| presentation.

| In connection with Niss 1 M he informs the reader that a bhikkhu
| who wears (or uses) an extra robe (*atireka-cīvara*) without having for-
feited it first, commits an offence of wrong doing. Thereafter he says
| that this is valid everywhere, and that, therefore, he will no longer speak
| of it afterwards (Kkh 99,4f., below, p. 200: *yathā ca idha, evam sabbattha,*
| *tasmā tam parato na vakkhāma*).

| In Niss 5 M in commenting on the word *aññātikāya* “by [a bhikkhunī]
| not related” he states that it is the same as above, i.e., in Niss 4 M, and
| that therefore, from here on out he will not consider [it] anywhere
| (Kkh 109,7f., below, p. 219: *tasmā ito param kathaci na vicārayi-*
| *ssāma*). Similarly in commenting on the word *cīvaraṃ* (“robe”) he says
| that it is one or other of the six robes suitable for formal assignment,
| and that this applies to all rules connected with robes. Thereafter he
| announces that he will say it if in any passage there is a specific mean-
| ing (Kkh 109,10f., below, p. 219: *yattha pana viseso bhavissati, tattha*
| *vakkhāma*). In Niss 11 M he explains how a rug is to be forfeited. Sub-
sequently he states that in accordance with this all types of rugs are to
be understood elsewhere. Because it is possible to know it even by this
much, he will not show it from this rule onwards (Kkh 119,25ff., see
below, p. 235). He gives further directives in connection with the classi-
fication system, as already discussed above (pp. xlivif.).

| Kkh’s syntactical constructions are partially complex, because its author
| heavily condenses information and writes in a concise and terse style. In
| the Samantapāśādikā the same information is phrased in a much more
| narrative way. Kkh is a demanding compendium which presupposes a
| good knowledge of Vinaya matters. Its many references to the

|¹ See also Kieffer-Pülz 2016b: n. 58.

1

Overcoming Doubts

Samantapāsādikā for a more detailed presentation, are not only helpful, but for the most part necessary. The author's usage of internal directives adds to the brevity of expression. As is quite common in Pāli commentarial literature, the author always uses the first person plural for his directives — “we will say” (*vakkhāma*), “we will show” (*dassayissāma*), etc. We find such directives also in other Aṭṭhakathās, but they are not as frequent as in Kkh and the later Tīkā literature. The sentence *yathā pana viseso bhavissati tattha vakkhāma* used twice in Kkh¹ is found once in Ps I 116,² and once in Sp IV 782,³ [Pāc 7 M]. A slightly deviating variant occurs in Yam-a.⁴ The statement that “from here on” (*ito param pana*) he will not say anything concerning a certain topic, also appears here and there in the commentaries (*aṭṭhakathās*), but rarely as often as in Kkh.⁵ He uses the verb *dassayissāma* five times in such directives,⁴ which appears once in some other Aṭṭhakathās, but more often in the Tīkās.⁵

A thorough investigation of the style and vocabulary of Kkh might yield further findings concerning its author and time.

¹ Kkh 109,11 [Pāc 5 M], 255,25 [Sekh 2].

² Yam-a 59,31f.: *yo pana yattha viseso bhavissati, tath' eva tam vaṇṇayissāma*.

³ Kkh 39,8 [Pār 1 M], 92,4 [Niss introduction], 108,21 [Niss 4 M], 109,7 [Niss 5 M], 119,26, 27 [Niss 11 M],

⁴ See Kkh Index of Words s.v.

⁵ For instance, in the Sāratthadipanī (see CSCD s.v. *dassayissāma*).

Page 49 job: 1272818

⟨I⟩ [I] The Commentary [called] Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī
("Overcoming Doubts")¹

*Homage to that Blessed One, the Worthy One,
the Fully and Perfectly Awakened One.*

[I. The Commentary on the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha]²
[A. The Account of the Inception of the Book]³

(1) Having venerated the Buddha, the Dhamma, and the Saṅgha with a mind purified — those recipients of veneration (*vandanā*), respect (*māna*), worship (*pūjā*), and honour (*sakkāra*) —

(2) Having paid homage with cupped hands to the leonine former teachers,⁴ those lamps of the lineage of the Elders who were firm in the tradition of the Discipline,

(3–6) Being asked by the Elder Soṇa — who is devoted to the practice of the Discipline, who is mild, humble, and who practises pure austerity — I will expound⁵ the commentary on

¹ Title in C^e: "The Commentary on the Lists [of rules] (that is, the Bhikkhu and Bhikkhuni Pātimokkha) called 'Overcoming Doubts'" (*Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī nāma Mātikāṭṭhakathā*). B^e at the end of the text gives the title "Commentary on the Pātimokkha called 'Overcoming Doubts'" (*Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī nāma pātimokkha-vanmanā*, Kkh 375,11). In more recent texts, Kkh is called Mātikāṭṭhakathā (Kkh-pt 1,5; Kkh-nt 117,13; 337,25; 489,2; Vin-vn-ṭ I 131,18; 280,21; 524,19; 543,6; II 2,1f; 79,21; 121,21; 445,5). Much more often, however, the second *a* is long (*mātikāṭṭhakathā*, Pālim-nt 23 times; Sp-ṭ 43 times; Vjb 29 times; Vmv 33 times). Cf. von Hinüber 1996a: § 221. CPD s.v. *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī* mistakenly gives the abbreviation as Khk rather than Kkh.

² This is the title in C^e (wrongly attributed to Pāṭ (B^e) in Pāṭ I, n. 1).

³ Translating B^e: *ganthārambhakathā*. C^e omits.

⁴ *pubbācariyasīhanām*; otherwise found in several of Dhammapāla's commentaries (Ud-a 2,2, It-a 2,2, Th-a 1,23, Cp-a 1,25, etc.).

⁵ Kkh I,16 *vattayissāmi* with vv.ll. *kathayissāmi* ("I shall explain") and *vanna-yissāmi* ("I shall expose"); Kkh-nt 124,26, quotes *vanṇayissāmi* (giving *vatta-yissāmi* ("I shall pursue") as the reading of Kkh B^e in n. 2), and explains it by *pavattayissāmi* ("I shall set forth").

2

Bhikkhupātimokha: B. The Introduction

⟨I⟩

the Pātimokha for the bhikkhus who have doubts originating therein; [of the Pātimokha] which was made known by the Great Sage as being the foremost of faultless Teachings, as the gateway for entry into release; [I will expound the commentary] called “Overcoming Doubt” (Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī), which is pure, is based on the way of recitation of the inhabitants of the Mahāvihāra, [and] is a complete (or perfect) investigation for the sake of crossing over doubts.

[B. The Commentary on the Introduction]¹

[The Recitation of the Introduction]

Reverend sir, let the Saṅgha listen to me. Today is the observance of the fifteenth [day]. If the appropriate time² has come for the Saṅgha, the Saṅgha should carry out the observance, it should recite the Pātimokha.

What is the preliminary duty for the Saṅgha? Venerable sirs, you should announce [your] purity.³ I shall recite the Pātimokha.

Let all of us being [present] listen to it carefully; let us pay attention. For whom there may be an offence, he should reveal it.

There being no offence, silence is to be kept. I shall know by their silence that the venerable ones are pure.

As there is an answer of one questioned individually,⁴ so it⁵ is

¹ C^e omits. For the introduction to the Pātimokha, see von Hinüber 1996a: §§ 25f., 222f., and von Hinüber 1999: 7f.

² *patta-kallam*; since this sentence is part of the motion (*ñatti*), the Saṅgha is assembled with the intention of carrying out the respective procedure (*kamma**), and therefore translations such as “if it seems right” (BD IV 138) are not correct. Cf. Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 61, n. 97.

³ Concerning the announcement of purity, there are two options. For details, see Appendix 1.

⁴ BD IV 132: wrongly “for each question”. *pacceka-puṭṭhassa* is clearly explained in Vin I 103,30–33: *yathā kho pana paccekapuṭṭhassa veyyākaraṇam hotīti* (Vin I 103,4f.) *yathā ekena eko puṭṭho vyākareyya, evam eva tassā parisāya jānitabbam “mam pucchatī” ti.* (cf. VinTexts I 244; BD IV 134).

“As there is an answer of one questioned individually means: As one [person] questioned by [another] one would answer, so it should be understood by the assembly, ‘He questions me.’”

⁵ What “it” stands for was not very clear, even for the tradition, as the existence of several interpretations shows (Kkh 24,15–25,25; below, pp. 50ff.).

(2)

B. The Introduction

3

proclaimed up to the third time in such an assembly [as this].

(2) But if any bhikkhu, when it is being proclaimed up to the third time, on remembering it should not reveal an offence which exists, it is a conscious lie for him. Venerable sirs, a conscious lie has been said by the Blessed One to be an obstructing matter.¹

Therefore any offence which exists is to be revealed by a bhikkhu who, having committed [an offence], remembers it and looks for purification. When [the offence] is revealed, it is good for him.

(Pāt 4.8–6.2 = Vin I 102,33–103,11, BD IV 132f.)

There I ask the venerable ones, “Are you pure in this?” A second time I ask, “Are you pure in this?” A third time I ask, “Are you pure in this?” The venerable ones are pure in this, therefore they are silent. Thus I record it.

Recited, venerable sirs, is the introduction.²

(Pāt 6,4–9)]

There, Pātimokkha (Pāt 4,10) [is to be analyzed as] *pa + ati + mokkha* (“forth” + “exceeding” + “release”); *ati + pamokkha* (“exceeding release”); exceedingly best, exceedingly excellent, is the meaning. Thus, even though it is of one kind according to the meaning of the word, it is twofold by being divided into virtuous conduct (*sīla*) and the text (*gatha*) [of the rules].

For likewise in [such statements] as: a—“He lives restrained by the restraint of the Pātimokkha”,³ a and b—“This is the beginning, this is the head, this is the foremost of wholesome teachings, therefore it is called the Pātimokkha”,⁴ b etc., virtuous conduct is called the Pātimokkha; in [such statements] as c—“Both Pātimokkhas⁴ have been properly transmitted

a—aVin II 95,30, etc. b—bVin I 103,12f. c—cVin IV 51,28f.

¹ For a discussion of the term *antarāyikā dhammā*, see BD III 21, n. 5.

² In Pāt the phrase “Recited, venerable sirs, is the introduction” (Pāt 6,4) is put before the paragraph (Pāt 6,5–8) in which the reciter asks the monks whether they are pure. The same order is found in Kkh E^e 2003 (2,6 and 2,6–10). The entire passage ends with “The introduction is finished” (*nidānam niṭṭhitam*) in Pāt 6,9 and Kkh 2,11. The reading of Pāt makes it difficult to see where the introduction actually ends. For a discussion of this sequence see Appendix 2.

³ Cf. PTC III 249, s.v. *pātimokkhasaṇvaraṣaṇvuto*.

⁴ That is to say, the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha and the Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha. For a discussion of how the term *pātimokkha* has been explained by earlier scholars, see BD I xiif.

4

Bhikkhupātimokkha: B. The Introduction

⟨3⟩

to him in detail.”^{1–c} the text is called the Pātimokkha.

There, “virtuous conduct” (*sīlam*) [is]^d the Pātimokkha [insofar as] whoever protects it, guards it, him it frees, sets free from sufferings such as those belonging to the states of misery (i.e. hells)^d or from fears such as self-reproach. But the text is called Pātimokkha because of the illuminating [quality] of that Pātimokkha. Now the meaning of the word given at the beginning [of this commentary] is in common to both (i.e. to *sīla* and *gantha*). There, this explanation fits in (*yujjati*) for the Pātimokkha as virtuous conduct and for the Pātimokkha as text. For when the text has been explained, the meaning of it (that is, virtuous conduct) has been explained as well.

Now this Pātimokkha as text is twofold: (1) the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha and (2) the Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha. [2] There, (1) the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha beginning with “Reverend sir, let the Saṅgha listen to me” ⟨3⟩ (*suñātu me bhante saṅgho*, Pāt 4.8) is arranged according to five sections of recitation. (2) The Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha beginning with “Noble lady, let the Saṅgha listen to me” (*suñātu me ayye saṅgho*, Pāt 114.2)² is arranged according to four sections of recitation.

There, (1) the five recitations in the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha are called,

- (1.1) “the recitation of the introduction” (*nidānuddesa*),
- (1.2) “the recitation of [rules entailing] defeat”³ (*pārājikuddesa*),
- (1.3) “the recitation of [rules entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha”⁴ (*saṅghādisesuddeso*),

^{d–d}This part of the statement is handed down in several texts, among them Vism 16,25f. (*PoP* 19); Ud-a 223,12f. (*UC* II 575); It-a II 127,2f. (*CI* II 692f.); Nidd-a I 123,18f.; etc.

¹ “Both the Pātimokkhas come to be properly handed down to him in detail” (*BD* II 266); for the same sentence in the negative, see Vin I 65,7f. (*BD* IV 84); V 131,if. (*BD* VI 209), etc. This statement is handed down in many places also in the Suttapiṭaka.

² Kkh 3, n. †, refers erroneously to Vin II 272,24, a passage, however, which deals with the installation of a nun in the position of an adviser with respect to the stumbling blocks for nuns wishing to be ordained.

³ *pārājika**

⁴ This is not a literal translation. IBH, *BD* I 290 has “offence entailing a formal meeting of the Order”; von Hinüber 1985: 63 has “[die Gruppe von Vergehen], deren übrige eine enge Berührung [betreffen]”; this latter translation was

<3>

B. The Introduction

5

(1.4) “the recitation of the undetermined [rules]” (*aniyatuddesa*),
and

(1.5) “the recitation in [full] detail” (*vitthāruddesa*).¹

There, (1.1) “recitation of the introduction” (*nidānuddesa*) to begin with, [means,] saying:

Reverend sir, let the Saṅgha listen to me.² ... For, when [the offence] is revealed, it is good for him. ^eHere I ask the venerable ones: “Are you pure in this?” A second time I ask: “Are you pure in this?” A third time I ask: “Are you pure in this?” The venerable ones are pure in this, therefore they are silent. Thus I record it.^{3-e}

[Thereafter the Pātimokkha] is [completely] recited, when in the manner “*Recited, venerable sirs, is the introduction*”,⁴ etc., the remainder is proclaimed by means of the [portion] heard.⁵

^{e-e}Pāt 6,5-8.

rejected by Nolot 1987: 271f. from the point of view of content. According to the Theravāda exegetical tradition Saṅghādisesa means “[an offence, which is atoned by seeking] the order at the beginning and at the end” (*saṅgho ādimhi c’ eva sese ca icchitabbo assa*, Kkh 35,20 = Sp III 522,3), see von Hinüber 1995a: 9f. Several interpretations have been collected by Nolot 1987: 251ff.; see also Hüskens 1997a: 69f.; Nāṇasatī 2014: 45.

¹ These five types of recitation, in which the text of the Pātimokkha is recited up to the end of the introduction, the Pārājika section, etc. are given in Vin I 112,9-21 (BD IV 147). The subsequent text in Vin restricts the shortened forms of recitation to when there is danger from kings, thieves, fire, water, human beings, non-human beings, beasts of prey, creeping things, or danger to life or to the holy life. These five types of recitation are called the five purifications (*pañca visuddhiyo*) at Vin V 132,32f., 189,34f. (BD VI 213, 306).

² With this sentence the introduction begins (Pāt 4,8, see above, p. 2).

³ This is the last part of the introduction, that is, the question regarding the purity of the bhikkhus (see above, p. 3).

⁴ See Appendix 2 for a discussion of the order of sentences.

⁵ Kkh 3,11, etc., reads *avasese sutena sāvite*. According to von Hinüber 1968: 176f. (162) *avasesam sutena sāvitabbam* (Vin I 112,11f.; Sp V 1057,13f.) should be read as *avasesam sute na sāvitabbam*. The commentaries and sub-commentaries clearly understood *sutena sāvitabbam*, etc., not *sute na sāvitabbam*. They explain *sutena* by *sutapadena* (Sp-t III 276,20 = Vmv II 170,13), and *sutavasena* (Kkh-nt 128,14). See Appendix 2.

(1.2–1.4) [Having started] from the beginning of the introduction, having brought to an end [the recitation of] the [rules entailing] defeat, etc.,¹ the [name² of the respective] sections,³ etc., of the recitation of [the rules entailing] defeat, etc., are to be attached.⁴

(1.5) [Recitation in full] detail [is recitation in full] detail indeed.⁵

But on account of the statement: f—“The remainder [of the Pātimokha] can be proclaimed by means of the [portion] heard”, –f if an obstacle [to completing the recitation] arises in whichever unfinished [recitation] among the [five types of recitation, i.e.] “recitation of the [rules entailing] defeat”, etc. (1.1–5), together with this [obstacle] the remainder [of the Pātimokha] can be proclaimed by means of the [portion] heard. But if “the recitation of the introduction” has not been completed, [the possibility of] saying, f—“[The remainder of the Pātimokha] can be

f–f Vin I 112,12, 13f., 16, 18f.; V 132,33, 35, 37; 133,1; 189,35f.

Our translation follows this traditional understanding. According to that, the portion of the Pātimokha heard on that occasion is representative of the whole text.

¹“Etc.” refers to Saṅghādisesa, Aniyata, and so on, depending on which type of recitation is to be followed.

² See Kkh-nṭ 128,20f.: *yojetabbā ti* (Kkh 3,13) *avasese sutena sāvite “udiṭṭho hoti pārājikuddeso” ti ādinā yojetabbā*. “[The sections] are to be attached [means] when the rest [of the Pātimokha] is proclaimed by means of the [portion] heard, [the sections] are to be attached [in the manner] beginning with ‘Recited [is] the recitation of the [rules entailing] expulsion.’” This sentence only gives the name of the type of recitation chosen.

³ *pariccheda* is *pātimokkhuddesa-pariccheda* (Kkh-nṭ 128,15f.). With the sections to be attached, the mere name of the respective sections could have been meant (see above, p. 6, n. 2), or, possibly, a sentence containing the name of the section as the one transmitted in Sp V 1057,18–20: “*sutā kho panāyasmantehi cattāro pārājikā dhammā ... pe ... avivadamānehi sikkhitabban*” *ti evam avasesanī sutena sāvetabbam*. “‘Heard by the venerables are the four rules entailing defeat ... [All] should train [therein] without contention’, thus the remainder can be proclaimed by means of the [portion] heard.”

⁴ See Kkh-nṭ 128,16f.: *pārājikuddesādīnam paricchedā yojetabbā ti sambandho*. “The [names of the] sections of the recitation of [the rules entailing] defeat, etc., are to be attached; [that is] the connection.”

⁵ In this case, it is not necessary to say, “The Pātimokha in full detail is finished.” Kkh 3,13: a full stop should be inserted before the first *vittihāro*.

⟨4⟩

B. The Introduction

7

proclaimed by means of the [portion] heard”,¹ –f does not exist.¹

(2) In the Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha, however, the “recitation of the undetermined [rules]” (*aniyatuddesa*) is lacking: the remainder exactly [follows] the method stated [for the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha]. Thus, this will be the commentary on both of these Pātimokkhas arranged according to the five sections of recitation [for the bhikkhus] and four [for the bhikkhunīs]. But since here the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha is first, therefore, in order to initially explain it, the [following] is said:

Let the bhikkhus who are possessed of virtuous conduct and desirous of training listen to my ascertaining the meaning² of the words [which] begin [with], “Let [the Saṅgha] listen to me” (*suṇātu me*, Pāt 4.8).

For here, the [expression] *let [the Saṅgha] listen to* is an injunction to listen.

Me (me, Pāt 4.8) is a word pointing to the self of the [person] who is proclaiming.

Reverend sir (bhante, Pāt 4.8) is a word [indicating] respect and obedience. ⟨4⟩

Saṅgha (saṅgho, Pāt 4.8) is a word [indicating] a group of individuals.

And all these are the word[s] to be spoken first by the reciter of the Pātimokkha. For [these] were spoken by the Blessed One at Rājagaha when he prescribed the recitation of the Pātimokkha.³ Therefore, whoever recites the Pātimokkha should say “friend” (*āvuso*) [rather than “reverend sir”] if he is an elder of the Saṅgha;⁴ he should say

¹ That is to say, at least the introduction must have been recited.

² *atthanicchayam*, not in CPD, but see Childers s.v. *nicchayo*; Kkh-nṭ 130,1f.: **atthanicchayan** ti (Kkh 3,23) *abhidheyyāthassa c’ eva adhipāyāthassa ca nicchayanam vavatthāpanan ti attho*. “**Atthanicchaya** means determining, fixing the expressed meaning as well as the intended meaning.”

³ See Vin I 102,21ff. (BD IV 132).

⁴ *saṅgha-(t)thera*. Childers (s.v. *saṅgho*) says this is the “senior priest in any assembly of priests” and refers to Kassapa and Sabbakāmi; the latter was mentioned as the “elder of the Order, [the oldest] on earth” (*pathavyā samgha-thera* Vin II 303,26ff., BD V 421); it was a hundred and twenty years since his ordination. Seniority in the Saṅgha is determined by how long a bhikkhu has been ordained (See Vin II 162,16–20 [BD V 227]). Since the title

“reverend sir” (*bhante*) exactly in the manner handed down in the text (i.e. the Vinaya) if he is younger¹ [than the other bhikkhus]. For, either an elder of the Saṅgha should recite the Pātimokkha because of the statement, ^g—“The Pātimokkha is the responsibility of an elder”,^{2–g} or a younger [bhikkhu] should recite it] because of the statement [in the Vinaya], ^h—“Bhikkhus, I allow the Pātimokkha to be the responsibility of whichever bhikkhu there is learned, competent.”^{3–h}

Now even though with the word “Saṅgha” (Pāt 4.8) a group of individuals is described without distinction, the [Saṅgha] is also twofold: (1) a Saṅgha worthy of gifts (*dakkhiṇeyya-saṅgha*) and (2) a conventional Saṅgha (*sammuti-saṅgha*).

There (1) “a Saṅgha worthy of gifts” is called the group of eight noble individuals.⁴ (2) “A conventional Saṅgha” [is] a group of bhikkhus without distinguishing [levels of attainment].⁵ That [one] is intended here.

^{g–g}Vin I 115,32 ^{h–h}Vin I 116,7ff.

thera is applied to a bhikkhu who is of ten or more years standing, *saṅgha-(t)thera* can refer to any bhikkhu of a Saṅgha who is of more than ten years standing. This can be the oldest member of a Saṅgha, but does not necessarily have to be. In the present passage a general rule with respect to addressing the bhikkhus is formulated; therefore, the *saṅgha-(t)thera* would be any senior elder of a Saṅgha.

¹ *nava-katuro*, “younger” or “junior” in the sense of having been ordained as a bhikkhu more recently than the other.

² *therādhayyam*; in Vin I 115,32 (BD IV 152) the reading is *therādhikam*. Both readings are handed down in the present case (see Kkh 4, n. 2). Sp V 1059,24ff. and Kkh-nt 131,7f. list them as variant readings.

³ Since this is a relaxation of the preceding prescription, the *anujānāmi* here is to be understood in the sense of “I allow”, cf. DOP s.v. *anujānāti*. For a more detailed discussion, see von Hintüber 2015: 255–60.

⁴ Those who have attained (1, 2) the path and fruition of a Stream Winner, (3, 4) the path and fruition state of a Once Returner, (5, 6) the path and fruition state of a Non-Returner, and (7, 8) the path and fruition state of an Arahat.

⁵ The *sammuti-saṅgha* is comprised of the bhikkhus ordained in the regular way, that is, with a procedure [with a decision as] the fourth [element] after [putting] the motion (cf. Kkh-nt 131,23f); *avisesena*, “without distinction”, refers to the fact that no distinction is made between *ariya* (those in the group of eight noble ones) and *puthujjana* (an ordinary individual) (so Kkh-nt 131,24f.).

[3] But this [conventional Saṅgha] is fivefold by virtue of the procedure (*kamma**):

- (2.1) [a Saṅgha of] a group of four,
- (2.2) [a Saṅgha of] a group of five,
- (2.3) [a Saṅgha of] a group of ten,
- (2.4) [a Saṅgha of] a group of twenty, [and]
- (2.5) [a Saṅgha of] a group of more than twenty.¹

There, (2.1) it is suitable for [a Saṅgha of] a group of four to carry out each procedure of the Saṅgha, except for higher ordination (*upasampadā*), invitation (*pavāraṇā*), and reinstatement (*abbhāna*).²

(2.2) It is suitable for a [Saṅgha of] a group of five to carry out each procedure of the Saṅgha, except for ordination in the middle districts³ and the procedure of reinstatement.⁴

(2.3) It is suitable for a [Saṅgha of] a group of ten to carry out each procedure of the Saṅgha except only for the procedure of reinstatement.⁵

(2.4) There is no procedure of the Saṅgha a group of twenty cannot carry out.

(2.5) Similarly, [it is the same for] a group of more than twenty.⁶

Now the [Saṅgha] was spoken of in order to show that it is not suitable for [a group of] a smaller number to carry out a procedure which is to be carried out by a Saṅgha of a group of four, etc., but that it is suitable for [a Saṅgha of] a higher [number to carry out the procedure]. In this case⁷ [of carrying out the observance], however, each and every conventional Saṅgha, beginning with a group of four, is intended.

¹ Cf. Vin I 319,24ff. (BD IV 457).

² Cf. Vin I 319,26–29 (BD IV 457f).

³ A group of five (made up of four bhikkhus plus a fifth who is an expert on the Vinaya) is able to ordain in border districts. For an enumeration of the boundaries beyond which are found the border districts (and by implication the boundaries of the middle districts), see Vin I 197,20–31 (BD IV 266); see also von Hinüber 2002: 79f.

⁴ Cf. Vin I 319,29–32 (BD IV 458).

⁵ Cf. Vin I 319,32–35 (BD IV 458).

⁶ Cf. Vin I 321,37–20,2 (BD IV 458).

⁷ Reading *imasmin pan' atthe* with S^e (Kkh 4, n. 13) and B^e (not mentioned in Kkh). Kkh 4,23 has *imasmin pan' ettha*. Here, “this case” means the ceremony of the observance day according to Kkh-nt 132,12.

Today is the observance (ajj' uposatho, Pāt 4.8) means: today is the observance day (ajja uposatha-divaso). By this, he rejects a non-observance day.

By [the word] *the fifteenth [day]* (pannaraso, Pāt 4.8) he rejects any [other] observance day. For, with regard to the days, there are three observance days: (1) [the observance belonging to] the fourteenth, (2) the [the observance belonging to] the fifteenth,¹ and (3) the observance of unanimity.² ⟨5⟩ Thus three observances are spoken of.

There, (1–2) having carried out two [observances] in each of the three seasons of winter, summer, and the rains, [namely] in the third and in the seventh fortnight, [there are] six [observances] belonging to the fourteenth [day]; the remaining eighteen [observances] belong to the fifteenth [day].³ Thus, [there are] twenty-four observances in a single year. Now this [is] the common practice.⁴ But because of the statement [in the Vinaya], ⁱ—“Bhikkhus, I prescribe to recite the Pātimokha once in a fortnight either on the fourteenth or on the fifteenth [day]”, ^{5–i} and because of the statement beginning with, ^j—“the incoming [bhikkhus] are to accommodate themselves to the resident ones”, ^{6–j} [if] there is a reason such as this, it is suitable to carry out the observance also on another fourteenth [day than those mentioned].

^{i–i} Vin I 104,31ff. ^{j–j} Vin I 132,20

¹ The rule that the Pātimokha is to be recited only twice during each lunar month is given at Vin I 104,30–33 (BD IV 135f.). The fourteenth or fifteenth day of each fortnight, which lasts either fourteen or fifteen days, corresponds to the new-moon day or the full-moon day of each lunar month. See Hu-von Hinüber 1996: 89ff. For a table of the seasons, months, new-moon days, and full-moon days, see Appendix 3.

² sāmaggi-*uposatha*, see Appendix 4.

³ Compare Sp V 1035,13–16.

⁴ This is the standard regulation, from which there may be deviations as described below.

⁵ This rule was given because bhikkhus were reciting three times each fortnight (on the eighth, fourteenth, and fifteenth days).

⁶ If a group of incoming bhikkhus keeps a different observance day (either the fourteenth or fifteenth) from the resident bhikkhus, they should accommodate themselves to the residents if they are fewer or equal in number. If the residents are fewer, they accommodate the incoming bhikkhus.

But for those who have kept the earlier rains [retreat] (*purimavassa**) the full-moon day of the earlier Kattika, [i.e. the month of Assyuja,¹ is the invitation day], or, if for them indeed [this invitation] is spoiled by troublemakers, [and] they postpone² the invitation, then the fourteenth of the dark fortnight of the earlier Kattika (i.e. the new moon of the month of Assyuja) or the full-moon day of the later Kattika (i.e. the month of Kattika) [is their invitation day]; and those who have kept the later rains [retreat] (*pacchima-vassa**) have only the full-moon day of the later Kattika, [the month of Kattika, as invitation day]. These three are also invitation days.³ This too [is] common practice indeed.

But if there is a reason such as this [problem of troublemakers], it is suitable to carry out the invitation also on the fourteenth [days] which precede the full moon [days] of the two Kattikas (i.e. the earlier and the later).⁴

(3) But when in the manner handed down in the chapter on [the split in the Saṅgha of] Kosambi,⁵ the Bhikkhu Saṅgha has been split, when that bhikkhu [who is the cause of the split] has been restored, in order to settle that case the Saṅgha carries out the [procedure of] unanimity

¹ *pubba-Kattika-puṇṇamā*. Cf. CPD s.v. *Kattika*.

² *paccukkaddhanti*. Kkh-nṭ 134.15 explains it by *ukkaddhanti*, which means “to postpone” (CPD, DOP s.v.). The explanation of Kkh-nṭ (134.15–22), with respect to the content, refers to the postponement of the invitation. This is dealt with also in Kkh 228,3; 229.6–9 = Sp VII 1411,3–6 [below, p. 456] where the invitation on the regular date was spoiled for bhikkhus of a certain residence by troublemakers (described in Vin I 175f. [BD IV 231f.]. IBH (BD VI 364; n. 5) translates as “rejection” with the alternative “postponement (?)”.

³ Four dates are listed, but since two are identical, there are altogether three.

⁴ This is an allowance to carry out the invitation on the fourteenth instead of on the fifteenth day in the month of Assyuja. Regarding the month of Kattika, however, the regular date for the invitation according to the above given pattern is the fourteenth. Thus, in this case the present allowance would not make a change. The commentaries are silent regarding this question; only the present passage is quoted in Pālim 199,17ff. = Sp-ṭ III 288,7f.

⁵ See Vin I 337–60 (BD IV 483–513).

12

Bhikkhupātimokha: B. The Introduction

⟨6⟩

of the Saṅgha;¹ then, because of the statement [in the Vinaya],^k “First of all, the observance should be carried out, the Pātimokha should be recited”,^{2-k} every other day can be “a day of the observance of unanimity” (*sāmaggi-uposatha-divāsa*) except for the fourteenth or the fifteenth [day].

But for those who have kept the earlier rains [retreat], in fact, one [day]³ in the interval [between] the [full-moon days of the two] Kattika months⁴ can be “a day of the invitation of unanimity” (*sāmaggi-pavāraṇā-divāsa**).

Thus, by the [word] “fifteenth [day]” (*pannaraso*, Pāt 4.8) he rejects any other observance day among these three [possible observance days]. Therefore, whatever non-observance day is rejected by the words: “Today is the observance [day]” (*ajj' uposatho*, Pāt 4.8), [4] on [such] a [day], the observance should not be carried out indeed. But whatever other [day is] an observance day, on that [day], the observance can be carried out. ⟨6⟩

But if [the observance] belongs to the fourteenth [day], the one who carries [it] out should say, “Today is the observance of the fourteenth [day].” If it is [an observance] belonging to the fifteenth [day], he should say, “Today is the observance of the fifteenth [day].” If it is an observance of unanimity, he should say, “Today is an observance of unanimity.”

If it is the appropriate time for the Saṅgha (*yadi saṅghassa patta-kallam*, Pāt 4.8): here, it is the appropriate time (*patta-kālam*) means: the time for this procedure has come. Indeed, the appropriate time (*patta-kālam*) is the appropriate time (*patta-kallam*, alternative form). This indeed is grasped by four constituent parts here. As the teachers of the commentaries said,

^{k-k}Vin I 357.38

¹ *saṅghasāmaggiṇ karoti* is carried out by a procedure [with a decision as] the second [element] after [putting] the motion, see Appendix 4.

² This is the first act after the procedure to establish the unanimity of the Saṅgha.

³ Kkh-nṭ 135.22f.: *ayam evā ti* (Kkh 5.21) *yo koci divaso yeva*. “In fact, one [day] means: In fact, each day.”

⁴ For *kattikamāsabbhantara*, see Appendix 5.

- ^a-(1) [It is the day for the] observance; and
 - (2) as many bhikkhus as are fit [to act] in a procedure (*kamma-patta*)¹ [have come];²
 - (3) and shared offences (*sabhāgāpatti**) do not exist; and
 - (4) individuals to be avoided are not in it (i.e. in the Saṅgha).
- This is called “the appropriate time”.^{-a} (Pāt 2,¹⁴–4,²)

There, *observance* (*uposatha*, Pāt 2,¹⁵ = Kkh 6,8) means: one observance day among the three observance days.³ For when it is [a day such as] this, it is the appropriate time for the procedure of the observance of the Saṅgha. If it is not [such a day], it is not [the appropriate time]. As [the Vinaya] says, “And, Bhikkhus, the observance must not be carried out on a non-observance day. If anyone carries [it] out [on such a non-observance day, there is] an offence of wrong doing.”⁴

As many bhikkhus as are fit [to act] in a procedure (*yāvati kā ca bhikkhū kammappattā*, Pāt 2,¹⁴, Kkh 6,8) means: as many bhikkhus [as are] fit, proper, suitable for the procedure of the observance; according to the lowest [number there] are four [bhikkhus] of good standing;⁵

^{a-a}Sp V 1063,¹⁰⁻¹³

¹ *kammappatta*. See Nolot 1996: 75f., n. 3.

² For this addition, see Sp VII 1333,^{18f.}

³ That is to say, those on the fourteenth day, the fifteenth day, or the day of an observance of unanimity (see above).

⁴ No canonical reference can be found for the whole quotation. Only the first half of this statements has a parallel in Vin I 136,^{7f.} (BD IV 180f.: “And, bhikkhus, Observance should not be carried out on a non-Observance day unless the Order be unanimous”; the second part of this sentence has to be translated as “except in [the case of a procedure of] unanimity of the Saṅgha”; see Appendix 4. Vin I 104,²³⁻²⁶ (BD IV 135) declares it an offence of wrong doing to recite the Pātimokkha daily, and gives the rule to recite it on an observance day only. Vin I 104,^{39f.} (BD IV 135f.) says it is an offence of wrong doing to recite the Pātimokkha three times during a fortnight, and gives the rule to recite it only once in a half month on the fourteenth or fifteenth day. At Vin V 220,^{7, 21f.} (BD VI 360) among the procedures that are invalid as to matter (*vatthuto kammani vipajjanti*), an observance held on a non-observance day is included.

⁵ *pakatattā*, see Nolot 1996: 122, n. 18. Kkh 6, n. 10 says “C^e adds: *saṅghena anukhittā*”, which means “not suspended by the Saṅgha”. This probably was a gloss on *pakatattā*.

14

Bhikkhupātimokha: B. The Introduction

⟨6⟩

and they are within one and the same boundary (*eka-sīmā*), without having left [the distance of] an arm's reach (*hattha-pāsa**) [between each other].

And this “boundary”¹ (*sīmā*, Kkh 6,20) is twofold by name: (1) a “determined boundary” (*baddha-sīmā**) and (2) an “undetermined boundary” (*abaddha-sīmā**). There, (1) having avoided (*atikkamitvā*) the eleven wrong boundaries, a boundary joined with the triple success,² agreed upon after marker has been connected³ with marker,⁴ is called a “determined boundary” (*baddha-sīmā*, Kkh 6,20).

For, because of the statement b—“procedures fail on account of boundaries in these eleven ways”,^{5-b} the [following] are called the eleven wrong boundaries⁶:

- (2.1) [a boundary that is] too small (*atikhuddakā*),
- (2.2) [a boundary that is] too large (*atimahati*),
- (2.3) [a boundary] with insufficient markers (*khaṇḍa-nimittā*),
- (2.4) [a boundary] with shadows for markers (*chāyā-nimittā*),
- (2.5) [a boundary] without markers (*animittā*),
- (2.6) [a boundary] agreed upon by one standing outside the boundary (*bahisīme thitasammata*),
- (2.7) [a boundary] agreed upon in a river (*nadiyā sammatā*),
- (2.8) [a boundary] agreed upon in the sea (*samudde sammatā*),
- (2.9) [a boundary] agreed upon in a natural lake (*jātassare sammatā*),
- (2.10) [a boundary] agreed upon by joining a boundary with [another] boundary (*sīmāya sīmām sambhindantena sammatā*),

b–b Vin V 221,5f.

¹ The rules for boundaries (*sīmā*) are given at Vin I 106–11 (BD IV 137–46).

² Success concerning *nimitta*, *parisā*, and *kamma-vācā**; see below, pp. 18ff.

³ *sambandhati* in this connection is unusual, but see Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 202.

⁴ This refers to the way in which the markers have to be announced. See Kkh 8,13–18, below, pp. 18f.

⁵ Vin V 221,10 begins with *imehi*. This may be the source for the v.l. *imehi* (Kkh C^e) instead of *imā hi* (Kkh 7,1).

⁶ Cf. for the whole list Vin V 221,6–11 (BD VI 360f.). For a detailed discussion of these eleven wrong boundaries, see Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 135–44. For a list of fifteen valid boundaries, see Kkh 102,12–103,28, below, pp. 206–10.

(2.11) ⟨7⟩ [a boundary] agreed upon by having a boundary overlap [another] boundary (*sīmāya sīmāṇi ajjhōtharantena sammatā*).

There, (2.1) “[a boundary that is] too small” (*atikhuddakā*, Kkh 6,23) means c-[a place] where twenty-one bhikkhus are not able to sit down.^{1-c}

(2.2) d-“[A boundary that is] too large” (*atimahatī*, Kkh 6,23) means: whichever [boundary] is agreed upon exceeding three leagues (*yojana**) even by the mere tip of a hair.²

(2.3) “[A boundary] with insufficient markers” (*khaṇḍa-nimittā**, Kkh 6,23) is said of [a boundary with] unconnected markers. After having announced the marker in the eastern direction, then having announced, in due order, [the marker] in the southern, western, [and] northern directions, and having again announced the [marker] first announced in the eastern direction [5], it is suitable to stop³ [with the announcement of the markers]. Thus it is [a boundary] without insufficient markers. But if, after having named⁴ [the markers] in due order,⁵

c-c Sp VII 1401,5 d-d ≠ Sp VII 1401,8-28

¹ This measure is not formulated in the Vinaya. It results, however, from the sizes of the Saṅgha given in the Vinaya. A Saṅgha able to carry out all procedures (including *abbhāna*) must consist of twenty bhikkhus (see above, p. 9) plus one bhikkhu being the object of the procedure. Thus, a boundary in which a Saṅgha can carry out all procedures must have room for twenty-one bhikkhus.

² Vin I 106,20-29 (BD IV 138).

³ *thapeti* here means “to stop”. Compare Sp V 1035,34–36,1: *evam paṭhamam kittitam nimittam kittetvā ‘va thapetabbam*. “Only after having announced in this way the marker announced first [before], is it permissible to stop.” Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 199, should be corrected accordingly.

A different method of announcing markers is described in the Kalyānisīmā inscription (fifteenth century C.E.). Here, the announcement above is repeated three times (Taw Sein Ko 1893: 238,3ff.: *purathimadisato paṭṭhāyānukkamen’ aṭṭhasu disāsu aṭṭhanimittāni kittāpetvā, paṭhamakittitānimittena ghaṭāpetvā tena nayena tikkhattum nimittāni kittāpesi*). Cf. Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 202, n. 135.

⁴ *āharitvā* as a verbal form in connection with *nimitta* is found in the parallels to the present passage only in Sp VII 1401,14f. = Pālim 179,4f. = 399,10f. = Vin-vn-ṭ II 177,2ff.

⁵ In the eastern, southern, western, and northern directions.

[and] after having announced the marker in the northern direction,¹ one² stops right there, it is “[a boundary] with insufficient markers (i.e. with a break in announcing the markers)”. Further “[boundaries] with insufficient markers (i.e. with deficient markers)” are [those] agreed upon, after [an object], which is not suitable as a marker (*animittupaga*)³ — [such as] a tree whose best part is in the bark,⁴ or a stump,⁵ or one (*aññataram*) of the heaps of dirt or heaps of sand⁶ — has been made a marker (*ekam nimittam*) in between [other markers which consist of objects that are suitable as markers].⁷

(2.4) “[A boundary] with shadows for markers” (*chāyānimittā*, Kkh 6,₂₃) means: [a boundary] agreed upon having made a marker of whatever shadow is there — the shadow of a mountain, etc.⁸

(2.5) “[A boundary] without markers” (*animittā*, Kkh 6,₂₃) means: [a boundary] agreed upon not having announced markers at all.⁹

¹ Without announcing again the marker in the east.

² A single bhikkhu or a Saṅgha, depending on how the announcement is performed, see Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 202.

³ One different from those allowed, and defined as being suitable as a marker (*nimittupaga*) in Sp V 1036,10–40,10 (Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B 2).

⁴ Defined as *animittupaga* in Sp V 1037,26f.: *rukkanimitte tacasāro tālanālikerādirukkho na vatṭati*. “With regard to the tree marker a tree whose best part is in the bark such as *tāla* and *nālikera* [trees] is not permitted.” Cf. Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B 2.4 and Kkh-nṭ 136,25f.

⁵ *khāṇuka*, “a dead tree”. According to Sp V 1037,27f. a tree that is suitable as a marker has to be a living tree (*jīvamānaka*).

⁶ *pamsupuñja-vālukapuñjānam*; this can be a problem, since heaps of pure dirt are otherwise allowed as markers (Kkh 8,19f.; below, p. 19). For details, see Appendix 6.

⁷ For the translation of *antarā* in this sense, see Appendix 7.

⁸ Vin V 221,8 *chāyanimittam sīmāṇ samannati* (BD VI 361,3: “he agrees on a boundary in the shade” has to be corrected to “he agrees on a boundary with shadows for markers”).

⁹ Vin V 221,8: *animittam sīmāṇ samannati* (BD VI 361: “He agrees on ‘not a marker’ as a boundary” has to be corrected to “he agrees upon a boundary without markers”; “agrees” never goes with *animitta*, but should go with *sīmā* (see Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 136, n. 222). BD VI 361, n. 4: “*animitta*: not all the markers having been agreed on by everyone”, IBH misunderstood Sp VII 1401,21f. (Kkh 7,14f., see above).

(2.6) “[A boundary] agreed upon by one standing outside the boundary” (*bahisīme thitasammata*, Kkh 6,23f.) means: [a boundary] agreed upon by one standing outside the markers after the markers have been announced.

(2.7–2.9) “[A boundary] agreed upon in a river, in the sea, in a natural lake” (*nadiyā samudde jātassare sammatā*, Kkh 6,24f.) means: [a boundary] agreed upon in those rivers, etc. For even a [boundary] agreed upon in this way, is in fact not agreed upon because of the statement [in the Vinaya], e—“Bhikkhus, an entire river is not a boundary, an entire sea is not a boundary, an entire natural lake is not a boundary.”^{1–e}

(2.10) “[A boundary] agreed upon by joining a boundary with [another] boundary” (*sīmāya sīmam sambhindantena sammatā*, Kkh 6,25) means: [a boundary] agreed upon by joining the boundary of others with one’s own boundary.^{-d f} For, if there are ⟨8⟩ two trees, a mango [tree] and a roseapple [tree], to the east of an old monastery that have their branches mingled one with the other, and of them, the roseapple [tree] is on the western side of the mango [tree], and the boundary of the monastery is determined after having announced the mango tree [as a marker, thus] including the roseapple [tree within the boundary], then later, when a [new] monastery has been built on the eastern side of that [old] monastery, the bhikkhus [of the new monastery] who determine the boundary [of that new monastery], determine [it] after having announced that roseapple [tree as a marker, thus] including the mango [tree within the boundary] — that is a boundary joined with [another] boundary.^{2–f}

^{e–e}Vin I 111,3f. ^{f–f}Sp V 1056,10–17

¹ BD IV 145: “No river, bhikkhus, is a boundary ...”. IBH’s translation fits the present context, where this sentence is quoted as a proof that no boundary may be agreed upon in a body of water. In the Vinaya context itself, however, this translation is somewhat misleading since in these bodies of water one form of an undetermined boundary (*abaddha-sīmā*), that is, the *udakukkhepa-sīmā*, can serve as a boundary for the bhikkhus. Thus, this passage should be translated there as “An entire river, bhikkhus, is not a boundary, an entire sea is not a boundary, an entire natural lake is not a boundary.” Cf. Kieffer-Püllz 1992: 85 (A 5.3), 334ff. (B 15.3.0).

² Kkh 8,6 *sīmāya sīmam sambhinnā*. Grammatically it should read *sīmāya sīmā sambhinnā*, which in fact is the reading of S² (see Kkh 8, n. 3), Sp V 1056,17,

(2.11) g—“[A boundary] agreed upon by overlapping a boundary with a boundary” (*sīmāya sīmam ajjhottarantena sammatā*, Kkh 6,25–7,1) means: [A boundary] agreed upon by overlapping the boundary of others with one’s own boundary. For, if one agrees upon one’s own boundary, in including either the whole determined boundary of others or a part of it^g that is called [a boundary] overlapped by a boundary.¹

Thus, escaping these eleven wrong boundaries [a boundary is] agreed upon.

“[A boundary] joined with the triple success” (*tividhasampattiyyuttā*, Kkh 6,21) [means: a boundary] (a) joined with success [regarding] the markers (*nimitta*), (b) success [regarding] the assembly [of bhikkhus] (*parisā*), and (c) success [regarding] the formula for the procedure (*kamma-vācā**).

There, (a) “[a boundary] joined with success [regarding] the markers” (*nimittasampattiyyā yuttā*, Kkh 8,12) means:

- (a.1) h—a hill marker (*pabbata-nimitta*),
- (a.2) a stone marker (*pāsāna-nimitta*),
- (a.3) a woods marker (*vana-nimitta*),
- (a.4) a tree marker (*rukha-nimitta*),
- (a.5) a road marker (*maggā-nimitta*),
- (a.6) an anthill marker (*vammika-nimitta*),
- (a.7) a river marker (*nadī-nimitta*), [or]
- (a.8) a [body of] water marker (*udaka-nimitta*).^{2-h}

Out of the eight markers thus mentioned, markers that are suitable as a marker [of a boundary] as [they] are obtained in this and that direction have been properly announced in the manner beginning: i—“What is the marker in the eastern direction?” “The hill, reverend

^{g—g≠} Sp V 1056,18–21 ^{h—h} Vin I 106,5–8 ^{i—i} Sp V 1035,33f.

and Pālim-ṇṭ I 353,26. Pālim 179,20 and Vin-vn-ṭ II 177,22f., however, read *sīmāya sīmam sambhinnā*. The reading *sīmāya sīmam* probably results from the commented text *sīmāya sīmam sambhindanti* or *ajjhottaranti*.

¹ Cf. similarly, Sp V 1056,18–21. Kkh 8,10 *sīmāya sīmam ajjhottaritā*. Instead of *sīmam* (also in Pālim 179,29; Pālim-ṇṭ I 354,5), *sīmā* would be expected grammatically, which is not listed here in the critical apparatus of Kkh. The correct reading, however, is handed down in Vin-vn-ṭ II 177,27.

² For these eight types of marker, see Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 204–33 (B 2.1–2.8).

(9)

B. The Introduction

19

sirs.” “This hill is the marker.”¹⁻ⁱ Then [the boundary joined with success regarding the markers] is agreed upon.

In this, the suitability [of objects] as markers [of a boundary] should be understood thus in brief.

(a.1) For a hill (*pabbata*) threefold by virtue of pure dirt (*pamsu*), pure stone (*pāsāṇa*), or a mixture of both, [and] higher than the size of an elephant is suitable as a marker. Smaller than this is not suitable.²

(9) (a.2) ^jWith respect to a stone marker (*pāsāṇa-nimitta*), even an iron ball counts in fact as a stone. Therefore, any stone^j that as a maximum starts [from a size] smaller than the size of an elephant [and]^k as a minimum [6] is the size of a lump of sugar weighing thirty-two *palas** is suitable as a marker. Smaller than that is not [suitable].^k But a flat stone (*pīṭhi-pāsāṇa*), even one that is very large,³ is suitable.⁴

(a.3) With respect to a marker that consists of a wood (*vana-nimitta*), a wood is suitable as a marker, even [one made up] of only four or five trees that either [all] have their best part inside (*antosāra*)⁵ or are mixed with [trees having] their best parts inside. [A wood with] fewer than that is not suitable.

(a.4) Only a live tree that has its best part inside, [well] established in the earth, ^aat least eight finger breadths (*āṅgula**) high (about 15 cm or 6 in.), in breadth even the size of a needle-stick^{6-a} is suitable as a marker. [A tree] smaller than that is not suitable.⁷

^{j-j}Sp V 1036,31–37,1 ^{k-k}Sp V 1037,4f. ^{a-a}Sp V 1037,28f.

¹ Sp V 1035,23–36,10 for a more detailed version (Kieffer-Püllz 1992: 198f.; B 1.0).

² Cf. Sp V 1036,10–31 (Kieffer-Püllz 1992: B 2.1).

³ *atimahanto pi*, means a stone exceeding the measure given above as a maximum for a stone. Since the stone is flat, the fact that it exceeds this size does not render it invalid as a marker for a boundary. See Kieffer-Püllz 1992: 212 (B 2.2.2).

⁴ Cf. Sp V 1037,9.

⁵ Trees are divided into the categories of *taca-sāra* and *anto-sāra*. The first category includes trees whose bark, leaves, etc., are used. The second category is comprised of trees whose best part is inside, that is, within the trunk; these are generally hardwood trees. Cf. Sp V 1037,18–26 (Kieffer-Püllz 1992: B 2.3).

⁶ For a discussion of *sūci-dandaka*, see Appendix 8.

⁷ Cf. Sp V 1037,26–38,6 (Kieffer-Püllz 1992: B 2.4).

(a.5) A road (*maggā*)^b—may be a footpath or cart track that goes through two or three village districts.^{1–b} Such [a road] is suitable as a marker^c—only if it is being travelled over by caravans on foot or caravans of carts;^{—c} one not travelled over is not suitable.

(a.6) An anthill (*vammika*), however, which^d—at the very least has come into existence that very day [and] is eight finger breadths (*aṅgula**) high, even an anthill having the mere [breadth]² of a cow's horn is suitable as a marker. [One] smaller [than that] is not suitable.^{—d}

(a.7) That river, which I shall speak about in [the passage containing] the definition of the unestablished boundaries,³ is suitable as a marker. Any other one [than this] is not suitable.⁴ ⟨10⟩

(a.8) Beginning with water (*udaka*) that is not flowing,^e—[that] is standing in a well, a lotus pond, a tank, a natural lake, a salt[-water lake],⁵ the sea, etc.^{—e} —^feven [water, that is] brought in pots [and] filled⁶ in a hole dug in the earth that very moment and remains [there] until the conclusion of [the recitation of] the formula for the procedure^{—f} — is suitable as a marker. Other [types of water] that are

^{b–b}Sp V 1038,7–9 ^{c–c}Sp V 1038,11f. ^{d–d}Sp V 1038,28ff. ^{e–e}Sp V 1040,1f.
^{f–f}≠ Sp V 1040,7ff.

¹ *gāma-kkhetta* is a synonym for *gāma** and *gāma-sīmā**. See Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 239, n. 289.

² Since the minimal height of the anthill is prescribed as being eight finger breadths, *go-visāṇamatta* cannot refer to the height. In analogy to other markers, where height and breadth is prescribed, *govisāṇamatta*, therefore, may refer to the circumference or breadth of the anthill. Cf. Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 223 (B 2.6.1).

³ The definition of “river” is contained in Kkh in the *abaddha-sīmā* section (Kkh 11,8–16; below, p. 24). Here, in the *nimitta* section, however, only a reference to this later portion of Kkh is given. In Sp, on the other hand, the definition is handed down in the *nimitta* section (Sp V 1038,32–39,8). Sp refers back to this in the *abaddha-sīmā* section (Sp V 1052,19), and it refers forward to this from the commentary on Sgh 3 N (Sp IV 912,6f.).

⁴ Cf. Sp V 1038,32–1039,28 (Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B 2.7).

⁵ In the long compound listing these different bodies of water, °*loni*– (so also Sp V 1040,2) should be taken as a separate item (correct accordingly Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 230, B 2.8.0). See also Sp V 1056,6f., “Even [a sea] containing salt (Salzsenke?, suggested by von Hintüber 1996b: 113) is called a natural sea” (*loni pi jātassarasaikham eva gacchati*).

⁶ *pūritam*; Sp V 1040,8f.: *pūrita-udakam*.

⟨10⟩*B. The Introduction*

21

flowing or do not remain for the time limit mentioned or that stand in a vessel are not suitable.¹

(b) “[A boundary] joined with success [regarding] the assembly [of bhikkhus]” (*parisāsampannatiyā yuttā*, Kkh 8,12) means: [a boundary] agreed upon by at least four bhikkhus who have assembled after all the bhikkhus who are within that village district² — [who] have not gone into a determined boundary [within this village district] or into a river, sea, or natural lake [within this village district]³ — have been brought within [the distance of] an arm’s reach (*hattha-pāsa**) [between each other] or after [their] consent has been brought [instead].

(c) “[A boundary] joined with success [regarding] the formula for the procedure” (*kammavācasampannatiyā yuttā*, Kkh 8,13) means: [a boundary] agreed upon by a pure formula for the procedure [with a decision as] the second [element] after [putting] the motion (*ñattidutiya-kamma-vācā**), [which] is said in the manner beginning with g—“Reverend sir, let the Saṅgha listen to me. As far as the markers all around have been announced ... ”.^{4-g}

Thus, having passed over the eleven wrong boundaries, a boundary joined with the triple success, agreed upon after marker has been connected with marker, is to be known as a “determined boundary” (*baddha-sīmā**).

g—gVin 106,9f.

¹ Cf. Sp V 1039,28–40,16 (Kieffer-Püllz 1992: B 2.8).

² Boundaries can only be determined on dry land; dry land is divided into *gāma** (that is *gāma-khetta*) and *arañña**. Since the boundary of a *gāma* can also be used as a monastic boundary, and since at the beginning of the determination of a *baddha-sīmā** no determined boundary exists, the boundary of the *gāma* is the measure for all bhikkhus. Therefore, the bhikkhus within the boundary of the *gāma* have to join the bhikkhus who want to agree upon a *baddha-sīmā** or — if they are not able to come — they have to declare their consent for the procedure (*kamma**).

³ A *baddha-sīmā** within a village does not count as a village. The same is valid for the different bodies of water. Therefore bhikkhus within *baddha-sīmās* or bodies of water in a village district do not count as being within the village, and so they are irrelevant with respect to the procedure of determining a boundary.

⁴ See also Kieffer-Püllz 1992: 61ff. (A 2.2). The reference in Kkh (10 n. *) to Vin I 108,10f. is to the same formulation, but in the formula for the determination of the house for the observance.

(1.1) The “boundary for a part [of the community]”,¹ (1.2) “the boundary for [those belonging to] the same communion”,² and (1.3) “the boundary for the [condition of] not being separated [from the three robes”³ are] a variety of that [determined boundary] only.

(2) Now the “undetermined boundary” (*abaddha-sīmā**, Kkh 6,²⁰) is threefold: (2.1) the village boundary,⁴ (2.2) the seven-*abbhantara* boundary,⁵ and (2.3) the “boundary [established by] throwing water”.⁶

There (2.1), as far as one village district — this is called “a village boundary” (*gāma-sīmā**, Kkh 10,¹⁷).

(2.2) In a wilderness, where [there is] no village⁷ seven *abbhantaras*⁸ all around, [this] is called “the seven *abbhantara* boundary” (*sattabhbhantara-sīmā*, Kkh 10,¹⁷). There, [an undetermined boundary] is permitted ^h—where [there is] no village, which means a wilderness in [a forest] like Viñjhātavi,⁹ etc., or [one] is permitted on islands in the

^h—Sp III 655,11–15, partly also Sp V 1052,13f.

¹ *khanḍa-sīmā*, translated literally by “Teil-Sīmā” in Kieffer-Püllz 1992: (192ff. [B Einl. 11], 242 [B 6.0]). Not to be confused with *khanḍa-nimittā sīmā* (“a boundary having insufficient markers”, see above, pp. 15ff.). Since the *khanḍa-sīmā* is a boundary for a Saṅgha that is part of a larger Saṅgha, it can also be understood as “the boundary for a part [of the community]”. This part, however, must consist of at least four bhikkhus for a Saṅgha to exist. As pointed out by Kieffer-Püllz (1992: 194), Kkh-nt 143,9 explains *khanḍa-sīmā* by *khuddaka-sīmā* (“small boundary”).

² *samāna-saṃvāsa(ka)-sīmā* (BD IV 144: “the boundary for the same communion”); cf. Kieffer-Püllz 1992: 190 [B Einl. 8].

³ *avippavāsa-sīmā**; according to Kieffer-Püllz (1992: 194 [B Einl. 12]) this is the name for a “boundary for [those belonging to] the same communion” (*samāna-saṃvāsa[ka]-sīmā*), which in addition has been determined as a boundary in which a bhikkhu is viewed as not being separated from his three robes, even if he in fact is. For this function, see Kieffer-Püllz 1992: A 4; B 13f.; 15.1.3; 15.2.3.

⁴ *gāma-sīmā**; see Vin I 110,36–11,3 (BD IV 145). Cf. Kieffer-Püllz 1992: A Einl. 10; 5.1; B 15.1.

⁵ *sattabhbhantara-sīmā**; see Vin I 111,1ff. (BD IV 145). Cf. Kieffer-Püllz 1992: A 5.2; B 15.2.

⁶ *udakukkhepa-sīmā**; see Vin I 111,4ff. (BD IV 145). Cf. Kieffer-Püllz 1992: A 5.3; 15.3.

⁷ *agāmake araññe*; for this translation, see von Hinüber 1996b: 106.

⁸ Seven *abbhantara** corresponds to between 76 and 86 metres.

⁹ Law 1932: 46: “Viñjhātavi comprises portions of Khandesh and Auraṅgabad,

middle of the sea which are not on the routes [taken] by fishermen.

“Seven *abbhantaras* all around” (*samantā sattabbhantarā*, Kkh 10,20) means: there are seven *abbhantaras* in all directions of those standing in the middle, [7] [i.e.] fourteen [*abbhantaras*] in diameter.^{1-h} There, one *abbhantara* is equal to the measure of twenty-eight cubits (*hattha**).ⁱ And this boundary increases by virtue of [the size of] the assembly. Therefore, the exact determination of the *abbhantara* has to be made all around, starting from the edge of the assembly.^j But if two Sanghas ⟨II⟩ carry out the observance separately, another single [space measuring] seven *abbhantaras* should be placed in between the two [boundaries of] seven *abbhantaras* for the purpose of an interval² [between the two *sīmās*].^j

(2.3) That boundary which, however, after the status of [being] a boundary was rejected for rivers, etc., in the manner beginning with “Bhikkhus, an entire river is not a boundary”^{3-k} was again spoken of [thus]:^a “Bhikkhus, in a river or in a sea or in a natural lake, the⁴ [boundary consisting of] throwing water all around by a man of average [strength], this [is the boundary] there for the same communion, for one single [or common] observance”,^{5-a} this is called a “boundary

ⁱ⁻ⁱSp V 1052,12f. ^{j-j}≠ Sp V 1052,14ff. ^{k-k}Vin I 111,3 ^{a-a}Vin I 111,4ff.

which lie on the south of the western extremity of the Vindhya range, including Nasik. The forest, therefore, should, strictly speaking, be located in the Dakkhināpatha.”

¹ *vinibbedha*. Cf. *nibbedha* (Childers: “penetration”). In the parallel passage at Sp V 1052,14, the reading is *vinivedhena* (v.l. -*vinibbe-*), for which Kieffer-Püllz (1992: 331) suggests “Durchmesser” (“diameter”), based on the context.

² *upacāra*. That is to say, in order that they might not overlap, etc. Another possible translation — “for purposes of access [for the bhikkhus]” — is, however, improbable, since *upacāra* is a t.t. here and elsewhere in the Vinaya and in Sp, where the distances between two *baddha-sīmās**, two *sattabbhanta-sīmās**, and two *udakukkhepa-sīmās** are called *sīmantarikā**, *upacāra**, and *sīmantarikā* respectively. This shows that *upacāra* and *sīmantarikā* are synonymous (Kieffer-Püllz 1992: 332f. [B 15.2.2], 340 [B 15.4.3]). Kkh-nt 145,18 *upacāratthāyā ti* (Kkh 11,2) *sīmopacāratthāya*.

³ For an interval means: for an interval between the boundaries.”

³ Vin I 111,3,4 (BD IV 145); see above, p. 17.

⁴ *yam*. This could be an early misunderstanding for *ayam*, since the text reads *vā yam*. In that case, *ayam* would refer to *udakukkhepā*.

⁵ Vin I 111,4ff. (BD IV 145). On *samāna-saṃvāsa* and *ekūposatha*, see Kieffer-Püllz 1992: 65 (A 2.2.2-3).

[established by] throwing water" (*udakukkhepa-sīmā*, Kkh 10,17f).

There, ^b-if the flow [of water] of a [river] is cut off with the mere disappearance of the rain clouds, when, in a period of righteous kings, it rains without surpassing every fortnight, every ten days, [or] every five days,¹ that [river] is not called a river. If the flow [of water] of a [river], however, is not cut off in such a period of plentiful rain, in the four months of the rainy season,^{-b} where, at a ford or non-ford, the lower robe of a bhikkhunī who has covered the three circles [of the navel and both knees] according to the definition handed down in the training,² gets her lower robe wet, even as little as one or two finger breadths (*aṅgula**), when she crosses [the river] without raising her lower robe, this is called a river (*nadī*) from its source, whether it flows into the sea or into a tank.

The sea (*samudda*) [is] indeed commonly known.³

Any ^c-hole, however, that is not [artificially] made by being dug out by someone, [but] is self-made and is lasting, filled with water that comes from all around,^{-c} [and] where the water remains during the period of the rainy season of the kind described for a river,⁴ that is called a natural lake (*jātassara*). Even a hole dug out by escaping water, after a river or a sea has broken [its banks], that also attains the characteristic

^{b-b}Sp V 1038,32–39,5 ^{c-c}Sp V 1052,23ff.

¹ This is the measure for a regular rainy season (*pakati-vassa-kāla*). Thus the definition of a river depends on its flow during such a rainy season. Cf. Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B 2.7.1.

² This is a reference to Vin IV 230,10–14 [Sgh 3 N] (*ekā vā nadīparam gaccheyyā ti nadī nāma timaṇḍalam paṭicchādetvā yattha katthaci uttarantiyā bhikkhuniyā antaravāsako temiyati ...* “**O**r **sh**ould **g**o to the **o**ther **s**ide of a **r**iver **a**lone means: having covered up the three circles (that is, the navel and the two knees), it is called a river there wherever, as a nun is crossing over, the inner robe is made wet.” BD III 189f.), and Sp IV 912,3–6: **a**ntaravāsako **t**emiyati *ti* *yattha* *yathā* *timanda* *lapa* *paṭicchāda* *naṁ* *hoti*, *evaṁ* *nivatthāya* *bhikkhuniyā* *vassakāle* *titthena* *vā* *atitthena* *vā* *otaritvā* *yattha* *katthaci* *uttarantiyā* *ekadvāṅgulamattam* *pi* *antaravāsako* *temiyati*). “**T**he **i**nter **r**obe **i**s **m**ade **w**et means: where, if a bhikkhunī, dressed in a way that the three circles are covered, at the time of the rains, descends at a ford or what is not a ford, wherever she crosses [the river], the inner robe is made wet even merely one or two *aṅgulas* (1.8 to 3.6 cm.”)

³ A new paragraph should start here at Kkh 11,17.

⁴ See the definition of the right season above (on this page).

⟨12⟩

B. The Introduction

25

[of being filled with water that lasts]; that too is a natural lake.

d—“The¹ [boundary consisting of] throwing water all around by a man of average [strength]” (*yam majhimassa purisassa samantā udakukkhepā*, Kkh 11,5) means: whichever area is exactly determined by throwing water all around by a man of average strength. There, as gamblers throw wooden dice, in this way water or ⟨12⟩ sand have to be thrown by a man of average [strength] with all his strength, after he has taken [them] in [his] hand. There, wherever the water or sand thus thrown falls, that is called “throwing water” (*udakukkhepa*).^{—d}

“There, this [is the boundary] for the same communion, for one single [or common] observance” (*ayam tattha samānasamvāsa ekūposatha*, Kkh 11,5f.) means: that [boundary], exactly determined by throwing water [is] the boundary for the same communion as well as for one single [or common] observance within these, a river, etc.; such a one, however, is permitted only within these, the river, etc., not outside. Therefore, any area in a river or natural lake^e—where water covers [it] during the four months in a regular rainy season^{—e} [and]^f—in any area in a sea where normal waves remain after overspreading it,^{—f} from there on it is a lawful site. Standing there, it is suitable to carry out the procedure of the observance, etc. [8] In rivers, natural lakes, even dry ones, whether during a drought or in summer, this is a lawful site. But if they (the villagers) dig up a pond in a dried up natural lake or sow [seeds in it], that area is a village district.² But whatever is described as a lawful site, a boundary [established] by throwing water does not run outside that. It can only run inside [such a lawful site]. Therefore, inside them (that is, the suitable sites), the exact determination is to be made by throwing water all around from the edge of the assembly.

But if two Saṅghas carry out the procedure of the observance, etc., each separately, one more “throw of water” is to be established in between the two [boundaries established by] throwing water [to establish] an interval [between the two].³ For, [both] the seven-*abbhantara* boundary and the boundary [established] by throwing water exist starting

^{d—d}Sp V 1052,28–34 ^{e—e}Sp V 1054,14f. ^{f—f}Sp V 1055,3f.

¹ *yam*, see above, p. 23, n. 4.

² The cultivation of these bodies of water leads to their being defined as *gāma** or *gāma-khetta*. See Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 352.

³ See above, p. 23, n. 2.

26

Bhikkhupātimokha: B. The Introduction

⟨13⟩

from the place where the bhikkhus are. [A bhikkhu] who is inside the exact determination (that is, inside the *sīmā*), [but] who has left [the distance of] an arm's reach (*hattha-pāsa*) [between himself and the other bhikkhus], as well as [a bhikkhu] who is outside the exact determination, [but] has not gone beyond another exact determination of exactly such a size,¹ invalidates a procedure.² This is the conclusion in all the commentaries. “Undetermined boundary” (*abaddha-sīmā*) is to be understood in this way.

Thus, in reference to that boundary which is twofold by virtue of the determined boundary (*baddha-sīmā*) and the undetermined boundary (*abaddha-sīmā*), the [following] is said, “And they are within one and the same boundary (*eka-sīmā*), without having left [the distance of] an arm's reach (*hattha-pāsa*) [between themselves and the other bhikkhus]” (Kkh 6,18–19). For, only if those four bhikkhus [as a minimum] are present within one and the same boundary, without having left [the distance of] an arm's reach (*hattha-pāsa*) [between each other], this is called the appropriate time (*patta-kallam*) for the procedure of the observance of the Saṅgha, ⟨13⟩ not otherwise. As [the Vinaya] says, g—“Bhikkhus, I prescribe that the Pātimokha be recited by four [bhikkhus].”—g

And shared offences (sabhāgāpatti) do not exist (sabhāgāpattiyo ca na vijanti, Pāt 2,15 = Kkh 6,9): h—here, any minor offence (lahukāpatti) which the Saṅgha as a whole commits with a shared subject matter (vatthu-sabhāga) such as “eating food at the wrong time” (Pāc 37 M) — such [an offence], which has the subject matter as a shared [element], is called “shared”.*³

g—gVin I 124,6f. h—hSp V 1064,11–14

¹ Depending on the type of *sīmā*, either a throw of water (*udakukkhepa*) or seven *abbhantara** (*sattabhbhantara*).

² *kammāṇi kopeti*. If a bhikkhu is within the respective boundary but outside the distance of an arm's reach (*hattha-pāsa*), the Saṅgha is not complete. If a bhikkhu is outside the boundary but within another *udakukkhepa* or *sattabhbhantara* from the boundary, he is too close, and thus disturbs the procedure (Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B 15.2.2; 15.4.3). The second part of this sentence is found neither in Vin nor in Sp, and its meaning is extensively discussed in subcommentarial literature, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 177f. n. 412.

³ Lit. “[an offence with] a shared element” (*sabhāga*).

An [offence] having the [class of the] offence as a shared [element] (*āpatti-sabhāga*), that has been committed by means of eating at the wrong time (Pāc 37), however, may be confessed in the presence of [a bhikkhu] who committed [an offence of the same class, but] by means of eating what has not been left over (Pāc 36) (i.e. by means of a different subject matter).^h

But when there is a shared offence [for all the bhikkhus], ⁱone bhikkhu is to be sent immediately to a neighbouring residence¹ by these bhikkhus [with the words], “Go, friend, come back after having expiated this offence. [Then] we will expiate the offence in your presence.” And [if] they (the members of the Saṅgha) obtain it (the expiation) in that way, that is good. If they do not obtain [it], the Saṅgha should be informed by an experienced, competent bhikkhu, “Reverend sir, let the Saṅgha listen to me. This entire Saṅgha has committed a shared offence. When [the Saṅgha] sees another bhikkhu who is pure, one who has committed no offence, then it will expiate this offence in his presence.” Having said [that], the observance is to be carried out.ⁱ

But if [the Saṅgha] is doubtful about [whether or not it committed a shared offence, the Saṅgha should be informed by an experienced, competent bhikkhu as follows]²: ^j“Reverend sir, let the Saṅgha listen to me. This entire Saṅgha is doubtful about [whether or not it committed] a shared offence. When it comes to be without doubt, then it will expiate that offence.” Having said [that], the observance is to be carried out.^j

ⁱ⁻ⁱVin I 127,5-13 ^{j-j}Vin I 127,17-21

¹ *āvāśā*, instr. or abl.sg.m. Similar to Vin I 116,32: *eko bhikkhu sāmantā āvāśā sajukam pāhetabbo*. “Monks, one monk should immediately be sent to a neighbouring residence ...”, BD IV 153; Sp V 1060,5: *sāmantā āvāśā ti* (Vin I 116,32) *sāmantam āvāsam*; “*sāmantā āvāśā* (ablative) means: to a neighbouring residence (accusative)”; Kkh-nṭ 149,9: *sāmantā āvāśā ti* (Kkh 13,8) *sāmanta-āvāsam*, *samipavihāran ti attho*. “*sāmanta-āvāśā* (ablative) means: to a neighbouring residence (accusative), the meaning is: to a residence near by”; Pāc-y 305,24f: *sāmantā āvāśā ti* (Sp V 1060,5) *ettha upayogatthe nissakkavacanan ti āha “sāmantam āvāsan” ti*. “*sāmantā āvāśā* (ablative) means: here the ablative case is used in the sense of an accusative, [thus the author of Sp] says, ‘to a neighbouring residence’.”

² For these additions, see Vin I 127,14-17 (BD IV 169).

But if, in this case, someone thinks that it is suitable to confess that shared offence [and] confesses [it] in the presence of another [bhikkhu, who committed a shared offence], ^kthe [offence] confessed is indeed properly confessed. But both commit [an offence of] wrong doing: (1) the one who confesses through confessing [it] to another [bhikkhu], (2) and the one who accepts [the confession] through accepting. These [offences of wrong doing for each of them] have different subject matters.¹ Therefore, [the offences of wrong doing] can be mutually^k confessed. [9] To that extent these two are free of offences. In their presence, the shared offences should be confessed or announced by the remaining [bhikkhus]. If they carry out the observance without having acted in this way, in the manner, “The venerable ones should declare [their] purity” (*pārisuddhiṃ āyasmanto ārocetha*, Pāt 4,_{11f}),² etc., they commit [an offence of] wrong doing which is prescribed with respect to the carrying out of the observance for [a bhikkhu] with an offence.³

⟨14⟩ If, when a shared offence exists, the entire Saṅgha carries out the observance without having translated into deeds the stated rule, the entire Saṅgha commits an offence in exactly the manner described. Therefore, if there is a shared offence, “the appropriate time” does not at all exist for the Saṅgha. Therefore it is said [in the Pātimokkha], “and shared offences do not exist” (*sabhāgāpattiyo ca na vijjanti*, Pāt 2,₁₅ = Kkh 6,₉). For it is indeed the “appropriate time” if such shared offences (*sabhāgāpatti*) do not exist, even if non-shared

^k–^kSp V 1064,_{15–18}

¹ *nānāvatthuka*, the opposite of the *vatthusabhāga* [*āpatti*]. See Nolot 1996: 131, n. 44.

² See also Vin I 102,₃₆–103,₁ (BD IV 132).

³ The explicit prescription with respect to the observance is handed down in the Cullavagga (Vin II 240,_{31ff}: *na ca bhikkhave sāpattikena pātimokkham sotabbam. yo suṇeyya, āpatti dukkaṭassa*; “Nor, monks, should the Pātimokkha be listened to by one who has [committed] an offence. Whoever should listen to it [who has committed an offence], there is an offence of wrong-doing”, cf. BD V 336), a reminder of this prescription is in the Mahāvagga (Vin I 125,_{32f}; 126,₂₀ *na sāpattikena uposatho kātabbo*, “The Observance should not be carried out by one who has [committed] an offence”, cf. BD IV 167f.). The respective rule regarding the *pavāraṇā* (which is judged for the most part following the pattern used to judge the rules for the observance) is handed down in Vin I 170,_{10–14} (BD IV 223).

offences (*visabhāgātti*)¹ do exist.

And individuals to be avoided are not in it (i.e. in the Saṅgha) (*vajjanīyā ca puggalā tasmīm na honti*, Pāt 4.1, Kkh 6,10) means twenty-one individuals are to be avoided:²

(1) a layman because of the statement, ^a“Bhikkhus, the Pātimokkha should not be recited in an assembly including laymen; if anyone should recite [it, there is] an offence of wrong doing”,^{-a}

and the following twenty:

(2) a bhikkhunī, stated in the manner, ^b“Bhikkhus, the Pātimokkha should not be recited in a seated assembly with a bhikkhunī”,^{-b} etc.,³

(3) a trainee (*sikkhamānā**),

(4) a male novice (*sāmañera*)

(5) a female novice (*sāmañerī*),

(6) one who has renounced the training (*sikkhā-paccakkhātaka*),

(7) one who has committed an extreme offence (*antimavatthu-ajjhāhāpannaka*),⁴

(8) one who is suspended for not recognizing an offence (*āpattiya-adassane ukhittaka*),

(9) one who is suspended for not expiating an offence (*āpattiya-appaṭikamme ukhittaka*),

(10) one who is suspended for not giving up an evil view (*pāpikāya-dīṭhiyā appaṭinissagge ukhittaka*),

(11) a eunuch⁵ (*paṇḍaka*),

(12) one in communion by theft (*theyya-samvāsaka*)*,⁶

(13) one who has gone to the members of another sect (*tittiyā-pakkantaka*),⁷

^a=aVin I 115,25ff. ^b=bVin I 135,25f.

¹ Lit. “[offences] not having the subject matter as a shared element”, that is, different with respect to the subject matter.

² This refers to the twenty-one persons named explicitly below (nos. 1–21), cf. Vin I 115,25ff. (BD IV 152); Vin I 135,25–36,5 (BD IV 180).

³ See Vin I 135,27–36,5 (BD IV 180).

⁴ That is, an offence resulting in expulsion (*pārājika**; Kkh-pt 18,28f.; Kkh-nt 149,29–150,1).

⁵ See below, p. 73, n. 1.

⁶ See below, pp. 58ff.

⁷ See below, pp. 61f.

30

Bhikkhupātimokha: B. The Introduction

⟨14⟩

- (14) an animal (*tiracchāna-gata*),
- (15) a matricide (*mātu-ghātaka*),
- (16) a parricide (*pitu-ghātaka*),
- (17) an Arahat killer (*arahanta-ghātaka*),
- (18) a violator of bhikkhunīs (*bhikkhunī-dūsaka*),¹
- (19) one who splits a community (*saṅgha-bhedaka*),²
- (20) one who sheds the blood [of a Tathāgata] (*lohituppādaka*)
- (21) a hermaphrodite (*ubhato-byañjanaka*).³

They are to be avoided by virtue of putting them outside [the distance of] an arm's reach (*hattha-pāsa**).

For, a Saṅgha that carries out the observance when out of these [twenty-one individuals, one of] the three types of suspended [bhikkhus] is present (8–10) commits [an offence entailing] expiation. [If one out of the] remaining [eighteen individuals is present, the Saṅgha commits an offence of] wrong doing.⁴

¹ See below, p. 62.

² See below, p. 62.

³ For similar lists (excluding the layman), see Vin I 120,34–21,18; 167,32–68,12; 320,4–16; 321,9–23; 322,7–17 (BD IV 159f.; 220; 458: 460; 461); Vin II 173,15ff. (BD V 243).

⁴ Numbers 8, 9, and 10 in the above list of 21. There is a list in the Vinaya of twenty types (nos. 2–21 of the above list) and the offence committed if one carries out the observance with one of them. Following this, an offence of wrong doing arises if the observance is carried out with individuals in categories number 2–7 and 10–21 (Vin I 135,25–30, 36–36,5). For numbers 8 to 10, however, the measure is *yathā-dhammo kāretabbo* (Vin I 135,30–35). IBH translates this “should be dealt with according to the rule” (BD IV 180, and n. 1) and suggests that this refers to Pāc 69 (see BD III 28, n. 4). Von Hinüber 1999: 54–62, and especially p. 56, deals in detail with this expression and translates it “‘der ist zum Handeln zu veranlassen als einer, der nach den Regeln [lebt]’, d.h. der Mönch soll sein Fehlverhalten eingestehen” (“he should be made to act as one who [lives] according to the rules, which means the monk has to confess his faults”). This expression when used in the Vinaya-piṭaka can always be related to a rule of the Pātimokha (according to Pruitt 2003: 64ff.); this is true even for the three cases excluded by von Hinüber 1999: 55). The phrase *yathādhammo kāretabbo* is replaced here by *pācittiya*.

(15)

B. The Introduction

31

And here, (14) “animal” (Kkh 14.13) [means:] for whom full ordination is rejected.¹ Members of other sects are included in [the word] layman.² For these, too, are certainly to be avoided. Thus “appropriate time” (*patta-kallam*) should be understood as [being] included in these four constituent parts.³

With this [phrase] *The Saṅgha should carry out the observance* (*saṅgho uposatham kareyya*, Pāt 4.9)⁴ he explains only an observance (15) in a Saṅgha, having rejected the other two ^cof these three observances,⁵ mentioned by virtue of the [one, who] carries [it] out, thus:

- (1) the observance for a Saṅgha,
- (2) the observance for a group (*gāya*), and
- (3) the observance for an individual (*puggala*).^{-c}

With this [phrase], *You should recite the Pātimokkha* (*pātimokkham uddiseyya*, Pāt 4.10),⁶ he explains only the recitation of the *sutta*, (that is, the Pātimokkha), having rejected the other two of the ^dother three observances, mentioned by virtue of the way in which they are to be carried out, thus:⁷

^{c-c}Vin V 123,20f. ^{d-d}Vin V 123,21ff.

¹ See Vin I 88,1f. (BD IV 111). C^e adds, “But flies, etc., are negligible”.

² No. 1 above. The heretics are regularly included in comparable lists too, therefore the commentator has to explain why the heretic is not listed here.

³ This refers to the stanza Pāt 2,14–4.2 = Kkh 6.8–11 (above, p. 10), listing four elements which constitute the *patta-kallam*. Here, the explanation of the stanza which explains *patta-kallam* (Kkh 6.6–14.22) ends. Kkh 14.21, the full stop after *patta-kallam* should be deleted.

⁴ Vin I 102,35 (BD IV 132).

⁵ See Vin V 123,20f. (BD VI 193). This is the second of three sets of three types of observance divided according to (1) the time, when the observance is carried out (see above, pp. 10f.), (2) the one who carries it out, (3) and the type of observance: *suttuddesa*, *pārisuddhi-uposatha*, *adhitṭhāna-uposatha*; for this, see Vin I 124f. (BD IV 164–66) and below, pp. 32ff. The present set of three is related to the last set of three since the number of bhikkhus present is decisive for the type of the observance.

⁶ Vin I 102,35 f. (BD IV 132).

⁷ Vin V 123,21f. (BD VI 193). This is the third set of three types of observances.

At Vin V 133,2f. (BD VI 213) these three types of observances are part of a list of five purifications (*pañca visuddhiyo*).

32

Bhikkhupātimokha: B. The Introduction

⟨15⟩

- (1) [the observance consisting in] the recitation of the text (*suttuddesa*),
- (2) the observance by [announcing] purity (*pārisuddhi-uposatha*),¹ and
- (3) the observance by [making a] determination (*adhitṭhāna-uposatha*).^{2-d}

(1) “The recitation of the text” (*suttuddesa*) is called the recitation of the Pātimokha. This is twofold: (1.1) the recitation of the Pātimokha of Instruction (*ovāda-pātimokha*)³ and (1.2) the Pātimokha of Command (*āṇā-pātimokha*).

There, (1.1) three verses are called the Pātimokha of Instruction (*ovāda-pātimokha*, Kkh 15,6f.) stated in the manner beginning with —

^e—Patience [and] forbearance are the highest austerity. [The Awakened Ones say Nibbāna is the highest. One is certainly not a wanderer if one injures others; one is not an ascetic if one harms another.]

The avoidance of all evil [action, the undertaking of good, the cleansing of one’s mind — this is the Teaching of the Awakened Ones.]

Not abusing, not injuring, [and restraint under the rules of discipline, and knowing moderation in eating, and secluded lodgings, and exertion in respect of higher thought — this is the Teaching of the Awakened Ones.]^{4-e}

This, only Buddhas recite, not [their] disciples.⁵ [10]

(1.2) That [which] is said in the way beginning with “Reverend sir, let the Saṅgha listen to me.” (*suṇātu me bhante saṅgho*, Pāt 4,8)⁶ is called

^e—^cD II 49,22–50,2; Dhp 184, 183, 185 (WD 184, 183, 185); Ud 43 (the last stanza only); Bv-a 239,8–16; Ud-a 298,27–32 (UC II 763); Sp I 186,26–87,3

¹ Two or three bhikkhus carry out the observance by [declaring] purity (that is the observance of a group), see below, p. 34, n. 5.

² A single bhikkhu carries out the observance by [making a] determination (*adhitṭhāna-uposatha*), that is the observance of an individual.

³ See CPD s.v.

⁴ Translation based on WD vv. 184–85.

⁵ This statement is also found in a discussion of the two types of Pātimokha at Ud-a 298f. (UC II 763f.). The unidentified quote in UC II 763, n. 404, is from the opening of the Pātimokha, Vin I 102,33f.

⁶ Vin I 102,33f. (BD IV 132).

the Pātimokkha of Command (*ānā-pātimokkha*, Kkh 15.7). This only discipiles recite, not Buddhas. And only this is intended as the Pātimokkha in this case.

(2) Among those, however, which are the other two observances [in the second set of three given in Kkh 15.3, above, p. 32], “the observance [by announcing] purity” (*pārisuddhi-uposatha*, Kkh 15.2) is, first of all, twofold by virtue of the declaration [of purity being made] (2.1) in the presence of others and (2.2) to one another.

There (2.1), also, the [declaration of purity] that is made in the presence of others is twofold (2.1.1) by virtue of [its] being carried out in the presence of those who have been invited [at the end of the rains retreat] and (2.1.2) [in the presence] of those who have not been invited.

There, (2.1.1) the [observance by announcing purity] is to be carried out in the presence of those who have been invited at the great invitation [ceremony] (i.e. on the full-moon day of the month of Assayuja)¹ by one who has kept [the rains retreat] in the later [period of the rains]² or has not kept [the rains retreat] or has interrupted the rains [retreat].³ In the presence of [those], who have been invited on the *cātūr-māsinī* (i.e. on the full-moon day of the month of Kattika),⁴ however, the [observance by announcing purity has to be carried out] by one who has kept [the rains retreat] in the earlier [period of the rains]⁵ or has not kept [the rains retreat] or has interrupted the rains [retreat; in both cases it has to be carried out], after having contributed to the

¹ *mahā-pavāraṇā* is the *pavāraṇā* on the full-moon day of the earlier Kattika (that is Assayuja), that is, the ceremony carried out by those who kept the earlier rains [retreat] (see *purima-vassa**). See Sp I 197.9–12; II 286,30f.; V 1076f.; Kkh 140,22.

² For details regarding the observance by announcing purity (*pārisuddhi-uposatha*) by one who has kept the rains [retreat] in the later period of the rains, see Appendix 9.

³ These two are comparable to one who will only carry out the *pavāraṇā* in the month of Kattika.

⁴ This is to say, *Komudī cātūr-māsinī*. This is the day of the invitation ceremony for those who kept the later rains [retreat] (*pacchima-vassa**).

⁵ *purimikāya upagatena vā*. These words are missing in the parallel in Pālim 200,14f. For details, see Appendix 10.

physical unity [of the Saṅgha by being present], by saying three times, “I am pure, reverend sirs; know me to be pure.”¹

(2.1.2) At every other time, except² for the invitation day [at the end of the rains retreat], however, as soon as the Pātimokha has been recited³ by the resident [bhikkhus], when [the assembly] has not [yet] risen or a part [of the assembly] has risen or the whole assembly has risen, and other [bhikkhus] of equal number or of a smaller number ⟨16⟩ arrive, purity is to be announced by them [the newly arrived bhikkhus] in their [the resident bhikkhus’] presence exactly in the way explained.⁴

(2.2) The [observance], which, however, is carried out by virtue of the declaration [of purity] to one another is twofold: (2.2.1) by virtue of being carried out having put or (2.2.2) not having put a motion.⁵

There, (2.2.1) in any residence where three bhikkhus dwell, on the day of the observance when they are assembled, one bhikkhu says, “Let the venerable ones listen to me. Today is the observance of the fourteenth [day]”, or “of the fifteenth [day].”⁶ And when the motion is put [thus], “If it is the appropriate time for the venerable ones, we should carry out the observance by [announcing] purity to one another”,⁷ a bhikkhu who is an elder puts his upper robe over one shoulder, sits on his haunches,⁸ holds up his cupped hands,⁹ and should

¹ This is the regular wording in the *pārisuddhi-uposatha*, see Vin I 124,24–27 (BD IV 164ff.).

² Kkh 15,24 *thapetvā ca*; this *ca* is omitted in C^e (Kkh n. 9) as well as in the parallel in Pālim 200,15. From the point of view of content this seems to be the better reading since this *ca* is paired with the following *pana*.

³ This clearly shows that “every other time” in these cases means an observance day.

⁴ See Vin I 129,25–30,17, 34–31,4, etc.; (BD IV 172f.), cf. Kieffer-Püllz 1992: 100.

⁵ The *pārisuddhi-uposatha* with three bhikkhus is performed with a motion (Vin I 124,7–27, BD IV 164f.). The *pārisuddhi-uposatha* with two bhikkhus is performed without a motion (Vin I 124,27–25,7, BD IV 165).

⁶ See Vin I 124,15, without the alternative regarding the days, however.

⁷ See Vin I 124,16f. (BD IV 165).

⁸ CPD s.v. *ukkuṭika* quotes PED: “The soles of the feet are firmly on the ground, the man sinks down, the heels slightly rising as he does so, until the thighs rest on the calves.” The position is more likely one where both feet including the heels rest on the ground.

⁹ IBH translates: “having saluted with joined palms” (BD IV 165), but the bhikkhu holds up his cupped palms while he is announcing his purity.

say three times, “I am pure, friends. Know me to be pure.” By the other [two] it is to be said in exactly the same way, saying “reverend sir” [instead of “friend”].¹ Thus [the observance by announcing purity] is to be carried out after having put a motion.

(2.2.2) But where two bhikkhus are dwelling [together], there, purity has to be announced in exactly the manner described [but] without having put a motion. This is “the observance [by announcing] purity” (*pārisuddhi-uposatha*).²

(3) But if there is only one bhikkhu, he, having performed all the preliminary functions,³ knowing that other [bhikkhus] are not coming, says, “Today is the observance of the fourteenth [day] for me” or “of the fifteenth [day]”,⁴ and then must say, “I determine.” This is “the observance by [making a] determination” (*adhitthānuposatha*).⁵

Thus, by virtue of the way they are to be carried out, three observances are to be understood.

So far, nine observances have been explained.⁶ Among them, the observance possessing three characteristics — [i.e.] (1) by virtue of the day, [it belongs to] the fifteenth; (2) by virtue of the [ones, who] carry it out, [it is] an observance [carried out by] a Saṅgha; and (3) by virtue of the way they are to be carried out, [it is] the recitation of the text (that is, the Pātimokkha) — is to be understood as the one explained here.

When it is [the observance day,] there arises [an offence of] wrong doing for one who, without having carried out the observance, in order to dwell [there], goes on that very observance day to another residence (*āvāsa**) or non-residence (*anāvāsa**) without bhikkhus or with bhikkhus belonging to a different communion (*nānāsamvāsaka**)⁷ unless [it is]

¹ In the example given in the Vinaya the two companions of the *thera* bhikkhu are *navakatara* bhikkhus (Vin I 124,13–27), thus they address the elder by “reverend sir”.

² For both types, see Vin I 124,7–25,7 (BD IV 164ff.), see above, p. 34, n. 5, and Appendix 9.

³ See Vin I 125,15–18 (BD IV 166). See also Pāt 2,5f., below, p. 36.

⁴ See Vin I 125,20 “*ajja me uposathō ti adhitthātabbañ*”, without mentioning the actual day, that is, the fourteenth or fifteenth.

⁵ The details given for the observance for a single bhikkhu at Vin I 125 (BD IV 166) do not include the statement of the day (the fourteenth or fifteenth) or the statement “I determine” (*adhitthāmi*); instead, for “he must say”, Vin I 125,20 has “it must be determined” (*adhitthātabbañ*).

⁶ See pp. 10ff.

⁷ That is, a communion whose members follow another explanation of the Vinaya

with a Saṅgha¹ or because of danger.²

What is the Saṅgha's preliminary duty? (*kim saṅghassa pubbakiccam*, Pāt 4,11)³ means: when the observance shall be carried out by a Saṅgha that has been mentioned in connection with the carrying out of the observance thus: *The Saṅgha should carry out the observance (saṅgho uposatham kareyya*, Pāt 4,9),⁴ [11] that [is the Saṅgha's preliminary duty] which is handed down in the text (i.e. the Vinaya) in the way beginning, f—“I prescribe, bhikkhus, to sweep the observance hall”,⁵ f ⟨17⟩ and [which] in the commentaries is shown as the ninefold preliminary duty by two names (i.e. *pubba-kicca* and *pubba-karana*), thus:

g—[Sweeping the place for the observance with] a broom⁶ and [lighting] a lamp, and [preparing] water [for drinking and for washing] together with seat[s] — these are called the preliminary functions (*pubba-karana*) of the uposatha.⁷

(Pāt 2,5f.)⁸

h—[The declaration of] purity [on behalf of absent bhikkhus],⁹ and [bringing] consent [to the recitation on behalf of bhikkhus who are ill],⁸ and announcing the time [to recite the Pātimokha,⁹

f—f Vin I 118,4f. g—g Sp V 1063,2ff. h—h Sp V 1063,6f.

rules. If this is the case, the arriving bhikkhu is not able to carry out the observance with the resident bhikkhus.

¹ This enables the arriving group to carry out the observance by themselves.

² Ten dangers are listed at Vin I 111,36–12,2 (BD IV 148). For the detailed list of all permutations, see Vin I 134,23–35,15, (BD IV 178f.).

³ Vin I 102,36 (BD IV 132).

⁴ Vin I 102,35 (BD IV 132).

⁵ For more information, see Appendix 11.

⁶ Cf. Sp VII 1333,14f.

⁷ For details of how bhikkhus are to declare purity on behalf of absent bhikkhus who are ill, see Vin I 120,14–21,24 (BD IV 158ff.).

⁸ Instructions concerning sending consent to a procedure from bhikkhus who are ill are found at Vin I 121,25–22,16 (BD IV 161f.). Cf. Sp V 1049,24ff.; 1056,33–57,3. For the compound *chanda-pārisuddhi*, see Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 236, n. 285. In addition to the sending of consent for a bhikkhu who is insane, the Saṅgha can give general permission on behalf of the insane bhikkhu (*ummattaka-sammuti*) (Vin I 123,1–37, BD IV 163f.). The translation in BD (“give the agreement for a madman to such a madman”) is misleading.

⁹ The announcement of the observance day is to be made by a bhikkhu who is

and] counting the [participating] bhikkhus,¹ [and] the instruction (*ovāda**) [of the bhikkhunīs], these are called the preliminary duties (*pubba-kicca*) of the observance.”²^h

(Pāt 2,9ff.)²

[If] one asks, why this has been done (i.e. why the preliminary duty has been shown), [the answer is] because it is not suitable to carry out the observance without having done the [preliminary duties] before. Therefore, the observance hall is to be swept,³ drinking water and water for washing is to be provided, seating is to be spread out, and the lamp is to be lit by a bhikkhu who is not ill when told [to do so] by an elder.⁴ If he does not do this, he commits [an offence of] wrong doing. It should be commanded also by an elder who knows what is appropriate.

[The declaration of] purity [on behalf of absent bhikkhus], and [bringing] consent [to the recitation on behalf of bhikkhus who are ill],⁵ (*chandapārisuddhi*, Pāt 2,9; Kkh 17,4) means: Here, when the Saṅgha has assembled in order to carry out the observance, consent is to be given by someone who, after having carried out the observance outside,⁶ returned, [and] having gone to the place where they assembled, does not contribute to the physical unity [of the Saṅgha].⁷ Also one who is ill or one who is intent upon [some] duty [to be done by him],⁸ by him too, in giving [his declaration of] purity, [his] consent

an elder, in good time, at the meal time, or at whatever time he remembers (Vin I 117,26–37 [BD IV 154f.]), so the bhikkhus will know the day.

¹ The bhikkhus can be counted by groups or by ticket (Vin I 117,15–25 [BD IV 154]).

² Cf. Sp VII 1333,16f.

³ See Vin I 118,1–12 (BD IV 155).

⁴ See Vin I 118,12–19,8 (BD IV 155f.), where an elder is to tell a bhikkhu who is not ill to accomplish these tasks.

⁵ See above, p. 36, n. 8.

⁶ Outside of the place where the assembled Saṅgha wants to carry out the observance. This regularly should mean outside the “boundary” (*sīmā*). Kkh-nt 155,20ff. explains that the single bhikkhu, who has carried out the observance already, returns from a boundary (*sīmā*) or from a river, and that he is not allowed to say *kato mayā uposathō* (“The observance has been carried out by me.”).

⁷ That is to say, he does not participate physically in the procedure. Cf. Sp V 1062,25–28.

⁸ Kkh-nt 155,22f. gives as an example the duty to care for an ill bhikkhu.

38

Bhikkhupātimokha: B. The Introduction

⟨18⟩

also has to be given. How is it (i.e. the consent) to be given? In the presence of a single bhikkhu, the [following] meaning should be made known by body, by speech, or by both: ⁱ—“I give consent. Convey consent for me. Declare my consent.”^j Thus consent is given.

But [a bhikkhu], having not carried out the observance, who is ill or intent upon [some] duty [to be done by him], has to give [his declaration of] purity. How is it (i.e. the declaration of purity) to be given? In the presence of a single bhikkhu, the [following] meaning should be made known by body, by speech, or by both: ^j—“I give [my declaration of] purity; convey [the declaration of] purity for me. Declare my purity.”^j Thus purity is given. But one giving [the declaration of purity] has to give [his] consent too. For this was said by the Blessed One, ^k—“I prescribe, bhikkhus, that one who on that observance day gives [a declaration of his] purity gives [his] consent too. [They] are the duty of the Saṅgha.”^{l-k}

There, the giving [of a declaration of] purity fulfils the carrying out of the observance for [both], the Saṅgha and for oneself; [it] does not [fulfil] the remaining duties of the Saṅgha. The giving of consent ⟨18⟩ fulfils the carrying out of the observance and the remaining duties for the Saṅgha only. But for him, the observance is in fact not carried out. Therefore, one who gives [his declaration of] purity,² has to give [his] consent too.

It is suitable for the previously mentioned simple consent, however, or³ for this [combined] consent and purity to be brought by one [bhikkhu] on behalf of many [bhikkhus] too. ^a—But if he (i.e. the bhikkhu bringing on behalf of others) sees another bhikkhu on the road [and] gives his own consent [and] declaration of purity as well as [that] of those for whom consent and [declaration of] purity had been taken by him, only his [consent and declaration of purity] reach [the Sangha]. But the other [consent and declaration] (i.e. that of the other bhikkhus)

ⁱ⁻ⁱVin I 121,32f. ^{j-j}Vin I 120,21ff. ^{k-k}Vin I 122,15f. ^{a-a}Sp V 1062,10-14

¹ IBH's translation (“I allow you, bhikkhus, on an Observance day, to give the consent also, by declaring the entire purity; they are the Order's business”) is misleading. Both declarations are to be given; giving one's declaration of purity does not automatically include giving one's consent.

² Cf. Sp V 1062,20-28.

³ Pālim 201,27 adds *pārisuddhim vā* (“or for the purity”).

is called the cat's chain consent and [declaration of] purity.¹ It does not reach [the Saṅgha].^{2-a} Therefore only he himself (i.e. the bhikkhu bringing the consent on behalf of others) should go to the assembly place and [then] declare [it]. But if he does not declare it intentionally, he commits [an offence of] wrong doing.³ But consent and [the declaration of] purity reach [the Saṅgha] indeed with his⁴ mere entering into [the distance of] an arm's reach (*hattha-pāsa**) of it (i.e. the assembly).⁵ [12]

Announcing the time (*utukkhānam*, Pāt 2,9, Kkh 17,4) means: pointing out the seasons thus: so much of the three seasons, winter, etc., has passed, so much is left.⁶

Counting the [participating] bhikkhus (*bhikkhugāṇanā*, Pāt 2,9, Kkh 17,4) means: counting the bhikkhus (resolution of compound), [saying] so many bhikkhus have assembled in the observance hall. For, only after both of these have been done may the observance be carried out.⁷

The instruction [of the bhikkhunīs] (*ovādo*, Pāt 2,10, Kkh 17,4) means: the instruction of the bhikkhunīs;⁸ for it is not suitable to carry out the observance not having announced the instruction requested by the bhikkhunīs. For the bhikkhunīs, who [thinking], “Tomorrow is the observance [day]”, have come [and] asked,⁹ “Is this the observance of

¹ *bilāla-samkhalikā chanda-pārisuddhi**.

² The passage on this question in Sp only mentions the case of a declaration of purity. Vin I 121,9-14, 122,8ff. (BD IV 160ff.) gives cases where a bhikkhu does not deliver the message for either consent or a declaration of purity, but this particular case, where he gives the consent and declaration of purity of others to another bhikkhu, is not mentioned.

³ See Vin I 121,21-24 (BD IV 160) for not declaring purity intentionally, Vin I 122,14 (BD IV 162) for not bringing consent.

⁴ That is to say, the bhikkhu who brings *chanda* and *pārisuddhi*.

⁵ See Vin I 121,14-24 (BD IV 160) where various cases are given in which bhikkhus might come to the assembly and not declare purity. The parallel passage for purity is abbreviated in Vin I 122,14.

⁶ See Vin I 117,3-14 (BD IV 154), where the Buddha prescribes that all the bhikkhus learn to calculate the fortnights.

⁷ See above, pp. 6f.

⁸ See below, p. 40, n. 2.

⁹ Two or three bhikkhunīs should go to request a bhikkhu to give the instruction, not four or five (Vin II 264,9-12 [BD V 365]).

the fourteenth or fifteenth [day]?",¹ [and they] come again on the observance day, [and] ask for the instruction² thus: ^b—“The Bhikkhunī Saṅgha pays homage to the feet of the Bhikkhu Saṅgha, sir, and requests [the time and place] for [them] to approach [the bhikkhunīs’ instructor] for the instruction. Let the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha obtain [the time and place] for [them] to approach [the bhikkhunīs’ instructor] for the instruction, sir.”^b Except for one who is ignorant, ill, or setting out on a journey, any other [bhikkhu], even if he is a wilderness dweller, is not allowed not to accept this [request].³ ⟨19⟩

Therefore, ^c—the bhikkhu [functioning as a] reciter of the Pātimokkha is to be addressed in the observance hall by that bhikkhu by whom [the request for the time and place for them to approach the bhikkhunīs’ instructor for the instruction] is accepted, in the [following] way, ^d—“The Bhikkhunī Saṅgha pays homage to the feet of the Bhikkhu Saṅgha, reverend sir, and requests [the time and place] for [them] to approach [the bhikkhunīs’ instructor] for the instruction. Let the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha obtain [the time and place] for [them] to approach [the bhikkhunīs’ instructor] for the instruction, reverend sir.”^d [The following] is to be said by the reciter of the Pātimokkha, “Is there any bhikkhu who has been agreed upon as the instructor of the bhikkhunīs?” If there is any bhikkhu that has been agreed upon as the instructor of the bhikkhunīs,^d then he should be spoken to [by] the [reciter of the Pātimokkha]: ^e—“The bhikkhu named so-and-so is agreed

^{b–b}Vin II 264,14–17; Sp IV 795,10–13 ^{c–c}Sp IV 795,13–21 ^{d–d}Vin II 264,18–23
^{e–e}Vin II 264,24f.

¹ See above, p. 10, n. 1.

² *ovādūpasāñkamanam*, literally: “the approaching for instruction”. CPD, s.v. “going to, attending the instruction, admonition, or instruction”; IBH translates, “the coming for the instruction” (Vin II 264,14–17 [BD V 366]). IBH’s translation is incorrect: “[M]ay the Order of nuns, master, hear what is [the right time for] coming for instruction.” Vin IV 315,3f. (BD III 358), clearly shows that the nuns have to go for *ovāda**, and Vin IV 57,1–4 (BD II 277) shows that bhikkhus are not regularly allowed to enter the nunnery (*bhikkhunīpassaya*) for instruction.

³ See Vin II 264,36–65,28 (BD V 366f.).

⁴ Note that the bhikkhunīs previously addressed the bhikkhu with the term *ayya* (“sir”) whereas the bhikkhu addressing the reciter of the Pātimokkha uses the term *bhante* (“reverend sir”).

upon as the instructor of the bhikkhunīs. Let the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha approach him.”^e

If there is no^c [bhikkhu who has been agreed upon], then [the following] should be asked by the [reciter]:^f “Which venerable one is able to instruct the bhikkhunīs?” If someone is able to, and if he is also endowed with the eight qualities,^{l–f} having agreed upon him [as an instructor of the bhikkhunīs] in that very place, the one who accepted [the request for] the instruction^g is to be spoken to:^h “The bhikkhu named so-and-so is agreed upon as the instructor of the bhikkhunīs. Let the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha approach him.”^h But if no one is able [to give the instruction], the reciter of the Pātimokkha should say,ⁱ “[There] is no bhikkhu agreed upon as the instructor of the bhikkhunīs. Let the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha gain success with a happy disposition.”^{2–i} For to such an extent, the entire teaching [of the Buddha] included in the three trainings^j is announced.

^{f–f} ≠ Vin II 264,28 = Sp IV 795,23ff. ^{g–g} Sp IV 795,25–96,27 ^{h–h} Vin II 264,24f.
^{i–i} Vin II 264,18–22

¹ Listed at Vin IV 51,19–37 (BD II 265ff.). The summary at Sp IV 791,10–15 says: He [the instructor of the bhikkunīs] (1) is virtuous, (2) is learned, (3) [knows] both [Pātimokkhas], (4) is of pleasant speech, with a pleasant voice, (5) is liked by the bhikkhunīs in general, and is pleasing [to them], (6) is competent to instruct the bhikkhunīs, (7) is not one who [previously committed an offence against an important rule], (8) is of twenty years [standing as a bhikkhu]. According to Sp IV 790,28–91,4, the important rule (*garu-dhamma*) in the seventh item means that while still a layman, before ordination, the bhikkhu had not had bodily contact (*kaya-samsaggam*) with a bhikkhunī or sexual relations (*methuna-dhammam*) with a woman trainee. IBH (BD II 266, n. 11) mistakenly identifies this as a reference to the eight important rules to be followed by bhikkhunīs.

² These words are to be spoken to the bhikkhunīs if there is no *bhikkhun’-ovādaka* in the community of the bhikkhus and if none of the bhikkhus has the eight characteristics (see the preceding footnote) qualifying him for the post of *bhikkhunovādaka*. What is being said by this, is probably that the bhikkhunīs will be able to live without the instruction by a bhikkhu.

³ That is to say, training in higher moral conduct (*adhisīla-*), higher thought (*adhicitta-*), and higher wisdom (*adhipañña-sikha*) (see A I 234f. [GS I 214f.]). See Juo-hsüeh 2000: 407f.

[If] a bhikkhu has accepted [with the word], “Good”, it should be announced to the bhikkhunīs on the first day of the fortnight. Those bhikkhunīs are to be sent by the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha, too, with the words, “Go, ladies. Ask, ‘Sir, does the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha obtain [the time and place] for [it] to approach [the bhikkhunīs’ instructor] for the instruction?’” Having accepted [with the words], “Very well, lady”, these [bhikkhunīs], having approached the bhikkhu, should speak thus: ⟨20⟩ “Sir, does the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha obtain [the time and place] for [it] to approach [the bhikkhunīs’ instructor] for the instruction?” By him [the following] should be said, j—“There is no bhikkhu agreed upon as the instructor of the bhikkhunīs. Let the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha gain success with a happy disposition.”j They should accept [with the words], “Very well, sir.”

And this is said because of two or three [bhikkhunīs] who have come together. But it is to be spoken and to be accepted by one single bhikkhunī among them. The others are her companions. But if either the Bhikkhu Saṅgha or Bhikkhunī Saṅgha [13] are not complete, or [if] both are only a mere group or a mere individual, there, this is the series of the [various] utterances:

[For a group of bhikkhunīs requesting a Bhikkhu Saṅgha:] “The bhikkhunīs pay homage to the feet of the Bhikkhu Saṅgha, sir, and request [the time and place] for [them] to approach [the bhikkhunīs’ instructor] for the instruction. Let the bhikkhunīs, sir, obtain [the time and place] for [them] to approach [the bhikkhunīs’ instructor] for the instruction.”

[For an individual bhikkhunī requesting a Bhikkhu Saṅgha:] “I pay homage to the feet of the Bhikkhu Saṅgha, sir, and request [the time and place] for [me] to approach [the bhikkhunīs’ instructor] for the instruction. May I, sir, obtain [the time and place] for [me] to approach [the bhikkhunīs’ instructor] for the instruction.”

[For a Bhikkhunī Saṅgha requesting a group of bhikkhus:] “The Bhikkhunī Saṅgha pays homage to the feet of the worthy ones, sirs, and requests [the time and place] for [it] to approach [the bhikkhunīs’ instructor] for the instruction. Let the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha, sirs, obtain

j-jVin II 264,32f.

(21)

B. The Introduction

43

[the time and place] for [it] to approach [the bhikkhunīs' instructor] for the instruction.”

[For a group of bhikkhunīs requesting a group of bhikkhus:] “The bhikkhunīs pay homage to the feet of the worthy ones, sirs, and request [the time and place] for [them] to approach [the bhikkhunīs' instructor] for the instruction. Let the bhikkhunīs, sirs, obtain [the time and place] for [them] to approach [the bhikkhunīs' instructor] for the instruction.”

[For an individual bhikkhunī requesting a group of bhikkhus:] “I pay homage to the feet of the worthy ones, sirs, and request [the time and place] for [me] to approach [the bhikkhunīs' instructor] for the instruction. May I, sirs, obtain [the time and place] for [me] to approach [the bhikkhunīs' instructor] for the instruction.”

[For a Bhikkhunī Saṅgha requesting an individual bhikkhu:] “The Bhikkhunī Saṅgha pays homage to the feet of the worthy one, sir, and requests [the time and place] for [it] to approach [the bhikkhunīs' instructor] for the instruction. Let the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha, sir, obtain [the time and place] for [it] to approach [the bhikkhunīs' instructor] for the instruction.”

[For a group of bhikkhunīs requesting an individual bhikkhu:] “The bhikkhunīs pay homage to the feet of the worthy one, sir, and request [the time and place] for [them] to approach [the bhikkhunīs' instructor] for the instruction. Let the bhikkhunīs, sir, obtain [the time and place] for [them] to approach [the bhikkhunīs' instructor] for the instruction.”

[For an individual bhikkhunī requesting an individual bhikkhu:] “I pay homage to the feet of the worthy one, sir, and request [the time and place] for [me] to approach [the bhikkhunīs' instructor] for the instruction. May I, sir, obtain [the time and place] for [me] to approach [the bhikkhunīs' instructor] for the instruction.”^g (21)

^k—At the time of the observance, that very bhikkhu should say [with reference to a group of bhikkhunīs requesting a Bhikkhu Saṅgha], “Reverend sirs, the bhikkhunīs pay homage to the feet of the Bhikkhu Saṅgha and request [the time and place] for [them] to approach [the bhikkhunīs' instructor] for the instruction. Let the bhikkhunīs obtain [the time and place] for [them] to approach [the bhikkhunīs' instructor] for the instruction, reverend sirs.”

k-k Sp IV 796,33–97,5

[With reference to an individual bhikkhunī requesting a Bhikkhu Saṅgha, he should say,] “Reverend sirs, a bhikkhunī pays homage to the feet of the Bhikkhu Saṅgha and requests [the time and place] for [her] to approach [the bhikkhunīs’ instructor] for the instruction. Let the bhikkhunī obtain [the time and place] for [her] to approach [the bhikkhunīs’ instructor] for the instruction, reverend sirs.”

[With reference to a Bhikkhunī Saṅgha — a group of bhikkhunīs — a single bhikkhunī requesting a group of bhikkhus, he should say,] “Reverend sirs, the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha pays homage — Reverend sirs, the bhikkhunīs pay homage — Reverend sirs, a bhikkhunī pays homage to the feet of the reverend ones and requests — request — requests [the time and place] for [it — them — her] to approach [the bhikkhunīs’ instructor] for the instruction. Let the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha obtain, reverend sirs, — Let the bhikkhunīs obtain, reverend sirs, — Let the bhikkhunī obtain, reverend sirs, [the time and place] for [it — them — her] to approach [the bhikkhunīs’ instructor] for the instruction.”^k

In the observance hall, too, it should be said exactly as in the previous way by the reciter of the Pātimokha, or by the one putting the motion, or by another bhikkhu if a bhikkhu has been agreed upon: ^a“Let the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha approach him — Let the bhikkhunīs approach him — Let the bhikkhunī approach him.”

If there is no [bhikkhu agreed upon for the instruction], it should be said: “Let the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha — Let the bhikkhunīs — Let the bhikkhunī gain^l success with a happy disposition.”

Having returned² on the first day of the fortnight, the one who accepts [the request for] the instruction³ should say exactly this.^{-a}

^{a-a}Sp IV 797,14–20

¹ The text contains three verbs combined into one in the English translation.

² *tam paccāharitvā*; or “having returned to the [Bhikkhunī Saṅgha (?)]” or “to the place, where the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha, etc., waits (?)]” or “having reported back the [statement (?)]”. Since the parallel in Sp reads only *paccāharitvā* (Sp IV 797,19f.), a variant not noted in Kkh, and since at least in two instances *paccāharitvā* is used in the meaning “to return” (Sp V 1047,29; 1048,9), not in the meaning “to bring back, take back” (so *PED* s.v.), this reading was preferred here.

³ The *ovāda-ppatigāhaka* is not necessarily the *bhikkhunovādaka*, but if there

This, here, is the regulation in brief.¹

So, only after having announced the instruction requested by the bhikkhunīs, may the observance be carried out.

Therefore it is said, [14]

^b-[The declaration of] purity, [on behalf of absent bhikkhus] and [bringing] consent [to the recitation on behalf of bhikkhus who are ill], and announcing the time [to recite the Pātimokha, and] counting the [participating] bhikkhus, [and] the instruction [of the bhikkhunīs], these are called the preliminary duties of the observance.^{-b}

(Pāt 2,5f., 9ff. = Kkh 17,4f.)

Venerable sirs, you should declare purity (pārisuddhim āyasmanto ārocetha, Pāt 4,11f.) means, you should declare your own pure state.

This [phrase] *I shall recite the Pātimokha (pātimokkham uddis-ssāmi, Pāt 4,12)*² is the statement that is the cause for the declaration of purity. Because of the statement [in the Vinaya], ^c-“And monks, the Pātimokha should not be listened to by one who has [committed] an offence. Whoever, [having committed an offence,] should listen to it, there is an offence of wrong-doing”,^{3-c} it is not suitable that those who are not pure (22) listen to [the recitation of] the Pātimokha. Therefore it is said: “Venerable sirs, you should declare purity. I shall recite the Pātimokha” (pārisuddhim āyasmanto ārocetha, pātimokkham uddis-ssāmi, Pāt 4,11f.).

Here it might be [objected] that because of it being said, “The Saṅgha should carry out the observance, should recite the Pātimokha”

^b-b Sp V 1063,6f. ^c-c Vin II 240,31f.

is no *bhikkhunovādaka* it seems to be his task to inform the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha by saying the sentence: “Let the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha gain success with a happy disposition.”

¹ The regulation in Sp is nearly identical, with the only difference that Sp also includes the possibility that one bhikkhunī is sent by several nunneries (Sp IV 796,8f.). The text to be spoken in that case is given in Sp IV 796,27-32.

² See also Vin I 103,1 (BD IV 132).

³ See above, p. 28, n. 3.

46

Bhikkhupātimokha: B. The Introduction

⟨22⟩

(saṅgho uposatham kareyya pātimokkham uddiseyya, Pāt 4.9f),¹ here too it should be said, “[The Saṅgha] will recite the Pātimokkha” (instead of “I will recite the Pātimokkha”).² For, this being so, the latter does agree with the former.³

[To this] it is said [by us]:⁴ It is only the mere word that does not agree,⁵ but from the characteristic it agrees. For, the [following] is the characteristic here:⁶ d—“Through the recitation [of the Pātimokkha] by an individual when a Saṅgha is complete, when a group (*gāṇa*) is complete, the Pātimokkha is recited by the Saṅgha, [the Pātimokkha is recited by the group, the Pātimokkha is recited by the individual].”^{7-d} Therefore only this is to be said here, “I shall recite the Pātimokkha” (*pātimokkham udisissāmi*, Pāt 4.12).

Let all of us being [present], listen to it carefully; let us pay attention (*tam sabbe va santā sādhukam sunōma manasikaroma*, Pāt 4.13),^e—the [word] “it” (*tam*, Pāt 4.13) means: the Pātimokkha.^e

^f—*All of us being [present]* (*sabbe va santā*, Pāt 4.13) means: as many as there are in the assembly, [bhikkhus who are senior] elders, [bhikkhus] of younger standing, and [bhikkhus] of middle standing.

Let us listen carefully (*sādhukam sunōma*, Pāt 4.13) means: being attentive, paying attention, let us consider [it] by virtue of the sense of hearing with all our mind.

Let us pay attention (*manasikaroma*, Pāt 4.13) means: becoming single-minded,^f let us fix [it] in our mind. And here, although it seems

d-d Vin V 177,26-29 e-e Vin I 103,17f. f-f ≠ Vin I 103,18-22

¹ See also Vin I 102,35f. (BD IV 132).

² The commentator here refers to the antagonism between *pātimokkham uddiseyya* (Pāt 4.10) and *pātimokkham udisissāmi* (Pāt 4.12) in the introduction to the Pātimokkha, and raises the possible objection that some may prefer *pātimokkham uddisissati* in the second case which is commented on here.

³ Kkh 22,5 read *pubbenāparam* for *pubbe nāparam*.

⁴ Kkh 22,5 “*ti vuccate*.” should be corrected to “*ti. vuccate*”; *vuccate* generally introduces the reply to an objection, as it does here.

⁵ In Pāt 4.10 the third singular is used, in Pāt 4.12, commented upon here, it is the first singular.

⁶ Kkh 22,8 the full stop after *ti* should be deleted.

⁷ The text in Kkh is abbreviated and stops with Vin V 177,27. Here, it is completed by the text in Vin. The quotation from the Parivāra is quoted as a proof for the correctness of the reading *pātimokkham udisissāmi*. Only an individual may recite the Pātimokkha, neither a Saṅgha nor a *gāṇa*.

as though it fits in (*yuttam viya*) to say, “[You] listen; [you] pay attention” (2nd person plural) because “*I shall recite the Pātimokkha*” (*pātimokkham uddisissāmi*, Pāt 4,12) is being said, [this] does not correspond with the [words], “*The Saṅgha should carry out the observance*” (*saṅgho uposatham kareyya*, Pāt 4,11), however. For, the carrying out of the observance belongs to the complete Saṅgha, and the reciter of the Pātimokkha is indeed included in the Saṅgha. Thus, because of the fact that he is included in the Saṅgha, it fits in (*yuttam*) to say only this: “*Let us listen; let us pay attention*” (*suñoma manasi karoma*, Pāt 4,13).

Now, in order to show that which is said there [in the introduction to the Pātimokkha] as if it is a declaration of purity, [i.e.] “*Venerable sirs, you should declare [your] purity*” (*pārisuddhim āyasmanto ārocetha*, Pāt 4,11f), he (i.e. the recitor of the Pātimokkha) says, “*For whom there may be an offence, he should reveal it*” (*yassa siyā āpatti, so āvikareyya*, Pāt 4,14). There, “*for whom there may be*” (*yassa siyā*, Pāt 4,14) means: anyone for whom there may exist an offence that was committed through one or other of the six ways. For, one who commits an offence, ^gcommits it in these six ways:^{1-g} through (1) ^hshamelessness (*alajjitatā*),² ⟨23⟩ (2) ignorance (*aññānatā*), (3) being by nature [over] scrupulous (*kukucca-ppakatata*),³ (4) thinking something is lawful (*kappiya-saññitā*) when it is not lawful, (5) thinking something is not lawful (*akappiya-saññitā*) when it is lawful, and (6) lack of concentration⁴ (*sati-sammosa*).^{–h}

(1) ⁱHow does one commit [an offence] through shamelessness? Knowing full well the fact that something is not lawful, spurning that, he commits a transgression.

^g–^gSp IV 872,8 ^h–^hVin V 102,26ff = Sp IV 872,8ff. ⁱ–ⁱSp IV 872,10–22

¹ These are given at Vin V 102,26ff. (BD VI 150). The first five are given also at Vin V 194,16f. (BD VI 312), and the sixth is in a second set of five given after the first five at Vin V 194,20f. (BD VI 313). The explanation at Sp VII 1375,32–1376,5 mentioned in BD VI 312, n. 1, does not refer to “thinking something is lawful when it is not lawful”, but to “not seeing” (*adassanena*).

² BD VI 150: “through being shameless”; 312: “from lack of conscientiousness”.

³ Vin I 102,26f. E^e *kukuccapakatattā* (B^e has: -*pakatata*); 194,16 *kukuccapakatata*; IBH translates this as “through being scrupulous by nature” (BD VI 150) and “from ordinary bad conduct” (BD VI 312).

⁴ BD VI 150: “through confusion of mindfulness”; 313: “from confused mindfulness”.

For, this has been said [in the Vinaya]:

j—He commits an offence intentionally. He hides the offence.

And he goes after the pursuit of wrong behaviour.¹ One such as this is called a shameless individual.—j

(2) How does one commit [an offence] through ignorance? An ignorant individual surely is foolish, is confused, and — not knowing what is to be done and what is not to be done — does what is not to be done, avoids what is to be done; thus one commits [an offence] through ignorance.

(3) How does one commit [an offence] by being by nature [over] scrupulous? [15] When scrupulousness has arisen concerning what is lawful and what is not lawful, having asked an expert in the Discipline, if [something] is lawful it may be done; if it is not lawful it is not to be done. Having spurned [the advice with the thought,] “But this is suitable”, he transgresses indeed. Thus, one commits [an offence] by being by nature [over] scrupulous.

(4) How does one commit [an offence] by thinking something is lawful when it is not lawful? He eats bear meat² thinking it is pork meat;^{3—i} k—he eats at the wrong time⁴ thinking it is the right time;^{—k}
a—thus one commits [an offence] by thinking something is lawful when it is not lawful.

(5) How does one commit [an offence] by thinking that something is not lawful when it is lawful? He eats pork meat thinking it is bear meat;^{—a} b—he eats at the right time thinking it is the wrong time;^{—b}
c—thus one commits [an offence] by thinking something is not lawful when it is lawful.

j—jVin V 158,23f. k—kSp IV 872,23f. a—aSp IV 872,25ff. b—bSp IV 872,28f.
c—cSp IV 872,30f.

¹ *agati-gamanañ ca gacchati*. For a discussion of this expression, see PS 174, n. 3.

² Bear meat is prohibited at Vin I 220,9–17 (BD IV 399) along with human meat and eight other types of animal meat (Vin I 218,28–200,17 [BD IV 298ff.]; cf. Sp IV 714,8ff.).

³ As meat allowable for bhikkhus indirectly (that is, as long as the animal was not killed specifically to feed them) the meat of cows (*go*), goats (*ajikā*), and buffalo (*māhisā*) is mentioned (Vin III 251,20f. [BD II 132]). Though the meat of pigs is not explicitly mentioned here, the present passage and its parallel in Sp show that it belonged to the lawful sorts of meat.

⁴ That is to say, after midday/solar noon.

(6) How does one commit [an offence] through a lack of concentration?^c ^d He commits¹ the [offence of] lying down together,² the [offence of] being separated from one's robe,³ etc., through a lack of concentration.^d ⟨24⟩

Thus, for whom [an offence] may be committed through one way or the other of these six ways, the offence is one or the other of the seven groups of offence⁴ for an elder, a [bhikkhu] of younger standing, or a [bhikkhu] of middle standing.⁵ [That is] the meaning.

He should reveal [it] (so āvikareyya, Pāt 4.14) means: [by that] it is said, "Let him confess⁶ or let him make known the offence."

There being no offence (asantiyā āpattiyā, Pāt 4.14) means: but for whom [there is] no [offence] committed in this way or having committed an offence the offence has now been expiated or confessed or declared, for him that offence is indeed non-existent. Thus [it is said], there being no offence, silence is to be kept (asantiyā āpattiyā tuṇhī bhavitabbam, Pāt 4.14).

By [their] silence, however, I shall know that the venerable ones are pure (tuṇhībhāvena kho pan' āyasmante parisuddhā ti vedissāmi, Pāt 4.16) means: For by [their] act of silence too I shall indeed know

^{d-d}Sp IV 872,3,f.

¹ āpajjati normally goes together with āpattim, which is missing in this sentence. Since sahaseyya^o ends in ādīni it cannot be referred to āpatti. Therefore sahaseyya^o-ādīni must be the object of āpajjati. The reading of Kkh 23,21f. is confirmed by Vin-vn-t II 485,11f. (sahaseyyacīvaravippavāsādīni sati-sammosāya āpajjati); and the quotation in Kkh-nt 160,19. Sp IV 872,31f., however, reads sahaseyyacīvaravippavāsabhesajcīvarakālātikkamana-paccayā āpattiñ ca satisammosā (v.l. ^osammosāya) āpajjati.

² For rules against a bhikkhu lying down together with laymen in a sleeping place, see Pāc 5 M (Vin IV 15,25–17,22, BD II 194–97).

³ For rules about being separated from a robe, see Niss 29 M (Vin III 262,25–264,35, BD II 156–159).

⁴ The word analysis (Vin I 103,22–25 [BD IV 133]) speaks of the five types or seven types of offence. IBH (BD IV 133, n. 10) points out that the five types are Pārājika, Saṅghadisesa, Aniyata, Nissaggiya, and Pācittiya offences; the seven types are these five plus Pāṭidesaniya and Sekhiya offences.

⁵ See above, p. 46.

⁶ deseti is the regular verb when an offence can be removed by confession; pakāseti is only rarely connected with āpattim, but here, it probably refers to those offences that cannot be removed by confession.

that the venerable ones are pure (*āyasmante parisuddhā*, Pāt 4.16).¹

As there is an answer of one who is questioned individually (yathā kho pana paccekapuṭṭhassa veyyākaraṇam hoti, Pāt 4.18) means: as one [person] questioned by one [other person] would answer, that is to say, as one [person] questioned individually by one [other person] would answer, having understood, “He is asking me.”

So it is proclaimed up to the third time in such an assembly [as this] (evam evam evarūpāya parisāya yāvatatiyām anusāvitām hoti, Pāt 4.19) means: here, first of all, some teachers say thus: “Whatever is proclaimed three times in such an assembly, ‘For whom there may be an offence, he should reveal it. There being no offence, silence is to be kept. By [their] silence I shall know that the venerable ones are pure.’² That is to be known by each [one] thus, ‘He is asking me.’ This is the meaning.”

This does not fit.

Why?

Because of the difference between the meaning and the letter. For, a [triple] subsequent proclamation (*anussāvana*) is not divided as to meaning and letter as in “And a second time I speak about this matter”,³ etc. But the triple uttering of “For whom there may be” (*yassa siya*, Pāt 4.14) is divided as to meaning and letter. Therefore the triple subsequent proclamation of that by him (i.e. by the bhikkhu reciting the Pātimokha) does not fit in. And if there were this subsequent proclamation up to three times, there would be an offence even if the recitation of the introduction is not finished.⁴ And it does not fit in to commit an offence in

¹ This sentence is terminated with an *ti* indicating the end of a quotation.

² *yassa siyā āpatti, so āvikareyya, asantiyā āpattiyā tuṭṭhī bhavitabbam. tuṭṭhībhāvena kho pan’ āyasmante parisuddhā*, Pāt 4.14–17.

³ This refers to the *anussāvana**, the middle portion of a formula (*kamma-vācā**) of a procedure [with a decision as] the fourth [element] (*ñatti-catuttha-kamma*) after [putting] the motion (*ñatti*). This *anussāvana* is repeated three times using identical wording; see for instance Vin I 56,14–26, etc.; III 173,36–74,6; 176,22–29, etc.

⁴ What is meant here is that, in the introduction, the bhikkhu reciting the Pātimokha explains to the bhikkhus how he will proceed. In that context he says that if no answer is given up to the third time by one who had committed an offence, that one is guilty. But the bhikkhu reciting here refers to the

(25)

B. The Introduction

51

an area of non-offence (*anāpatti-kkhetta*).

Others (*apare*), imagining that the meaning of the word “announced” (*anusavitaṁ*, Pāt 4.19) is “should be announced” (*anusāvetabbam*), say that the [phrase] “*up to the third time*” (*yāvatatiyam*, Pāt 4.21) is spoken with reference to the [phrase] above¹ at the end of the introduction: “*Are you pure? ... (25) A third time I ask you ...*” (*kacci ‘tha parisuddhā ... tatiyam pi pucchāmi*, Pāt 6.5ff). This, too, does not fit in.

Why?

Because of the absence of the correct meaning. For some teach this word as *anusāvita* (“announced”), some as *anusāveta* (“announced”). With respect to both cases, this indicates the past only, not the future. And if this (i.e. *anusavetabbam*) were the meaning of it (i.e. *anusāvitam*/*anusāvetam*), he would say, “It will be announced” (*anusāvitam hessati*). [16] Thus [this] does not fit in, first of all, because of the absence of that meaning. And if this were said with reference to the statement at the end of the introduction, there would not be a spoken lie even when the introduction is ended for one who thinks, “I shall not reveal [my fault].”

Why?

Because of the statement “*while it is being announced up to three times*” (*yāvatatiyam anussāviyamāne*, Pāt 4.21),² exactly this word “*up to three times*” (*yāvatatiyam*, Pāt 4.19) would be meaningless.

Why?

Because of the absence of a proclamation up to three times in the recitation of the introduction.³ Thus that too does not fit in because of the absence of the correct meaning.

[The phrase] “*it is proclaimed up to the third time*” (*yāvatatiyam anusāvitam*, Pāt 4.19f), however, [is] a mere statement of definition.⁴

questioning which will take place during the recitation of the Pātimokha after each section of offences. Only there does he say three times *kacci ‘tha parisuddhā* (see for example Pāt 10.12–15).

¹ Literally “below”; this refers to an earlier passage in a palm-leaf manuscript, which then is below in the physical sense.

² See also Vin I 103.7

³ The recitation of the introduction ends with Pāt 6.4. The triple question follows only thereafter (Pāt 6.5–8).

⁴ CI I 264, translates *lakkhaṇa-vacanam* as “voicing something that is implied”. See also 264, n. 3. Lakkhaṇa in most cases in Pāli scriptures stands for

With this¹ he shows the [following] meaning, “This Pātimokha indeed is being proclaimed up to three times. While it is being proclaimed up to three times, should anyone while remembering [it] not reveal an offence that [still] exists, that is a conscious lie for him by virtue of the proclamation up to the third time.” This [Pātimokha] as it is proclaimed is proclaimed indeed up to three times. In order to show that, it is said, “*There I ask the venerable ones*” (*tatth’ āyasmante pucchāmi*, Pāt 6,5), etc. But this becomes manifest at the end of the [section of the rules entailing] defeat, etc., not at the end of the introduction. Though it does not become manifest [in the introduction itself], nevertheless, at the time of the recitation, having said “*for when [the offence] is revealed, it is good for him*” (*āvikatā hi ‘ssa phāsu hoti*, Pāt 6,2), it should be said indeed in the way, “*Recited, venerable sirs, is the introduction. There I ask the venerable ones ...*”, etc. (*uddīththañ kho āyasmanto nidānam, tatth’ āyasmante pucchāmi*, Pāt 6,4f). For thus is the introduction well recited; otherwise it is wrongly recited. And with reference to this very matter it is said in the “Section on Observance” (*Upasatha-kkhandaka*), e—“It is proclaimed up to the third time” means: it is proclaimed once; it is proclaimed a second time; it is proclaimed a third time.”^{2–e} This, here, [is] the [detailed] interpretation maintained by the succession of teachers. ⟨26⟩

But if any bhikkhu, [when the Pātimokha is being proclaimed up to the third time, on remembering it should not reveal an offence which exists], it is a conscious lie for him (yo pana bhikkhu ... pe ... sampajānamusāvād’ assa hoti, Pāt 4,21f) means: there is a conscious lie for him; by this an offence of wrong doing arises for him.³ But this

e—eVin I 103,34f.

“definition” or “characteristic”. Accordingly, *lakkhaṇa-vacana* could be “a statement consisting of a definition”, “a statement defining”. Seyfort Ruegg (1969: 390) translates the Sanskrit term *lakṣaṇavacana* as “l’expression qui le définit”.

¹ Kkh-nṭ 162,11f: *tenā ti* (Kkh 25,11) *lakkhaṇavacanamattena hetunā*. “With this means: with the mere statement of definition as a reason.”

² This is the Vinaya explanation of Pāt 4,19.

³ BD IV 134, n. 3, discusses the question of why conscious lying here should only lead to an offence of wrong doing, though this is a Pācittiya offence (Pāc 1). IBH thinks *dukkāta* here refers to different stages in the growth of

[offence of wrong doing does] not arise because of the distinctive characteristic of lying (which would be *pācittiya*), but because of the [following] word of the Blessed One, ^f—“What [is the offence] in respect of a conscious lie?¹ It is [an offence of] wrong doing”,^{2–f} [and it arises] having its origination in inactivity (*akiriyā*) in respect to the door of speech.³ [Thus the conscious lie] is to be understood.

And this is said too :

^g—Not speaking with any man, if one makes no verbal utterance to others, one would commit a verbal offence, not a physical one.⁴ This question has been considered by the experts.—^g

An obstructing matter (*antarāyiko*, Pāt 4,23) means: having prevented the arising of joy, etc., on account of being the reason for remorse, it creates an obstacle to the attainment of the first *jhāna*, etc.

Therefore (*tasmā*, Pāt 6,1) means: since this [type of] conscious lie called non-revealing is an obstructing matter — therefore.

By [a bhikkhu] who remembers (*saramānena*, Pāt 6,1) means: by one who knows the offence present in himself.

^{f–f}Vin I 104,2f. ^{g–g}Vin V 216,33–17,1, Sp V 1035,1–7; cf. Sp VII 1391,29–92,2

legislation. But as Vin V 37,9–17 (BD VI 55f.) shows, five kinds of offences resulting from a conscious lie are differentiated: (1) a Pārājika offence, if one boasts a superhuman state which one has not obtained (Pār 3 M/N); (2) a Saṅghādisesa offence if one defames a bhikkhu with an unfounded offence entailing defeat (*amūlakena pārājikena*; Sgh 8 M); (3) a Thullaccaya offence if one acknowledges a conscious lie (see Vin III 99,1–6; V 33,33ff.; casuistry of Pār 4 M/N); (4) a Dukkaṭa offence, if one does not acknowledge a conscious lie (Vin III 99,6; V 33,35; casuistry of Pār 4 M/N); (5) a Pācittiya offence if one is consciously lying (Pāc 1). Cf. Kkh 143,17ff., below, p. 281, where the numbers 3 and 4 are also listed in the casuistry of Pāc 1.

¹ Vin I 104,2 E^e reads *sampajānamusāvādo*, B^e °vāde; Kkh 26,3; Kkh-nṭ 162,24 °vāde.

² This is the explanation of Vin I 104,2 to *sampajānamusāvād' assa hoti*.

³ See the classification of Pār 4 M, where the case of an offence of wrong doing is listed (Kkh 55,5ff., below, p. 123); Pār 4 M in general arises from activity (*kiriyā*) as does Pār 2, and is a physical as well as a verbal action, whereas here, the offence arises from inactivity in speech.

⁴ This means that a bhikkhu knowing about an offence does not reveal it and thus commits an offence consisting in a conscious lie arising out of inactivity.

54

Bhikkhupātimokkha: B. The Introduction

⟨27⟩

^h-*By [a bhikkhū] who looks for purification (visuddhāpekkhena, Pāt 6,if.) means: by one wishing to remove [the offence], wishing to be purified.*^{-h}

[Any] offence which exists (*santī āpatti*, Pāt 6,2) means: having committed an offence, it has not been expiated.

[The offence] is to be revealed (*āvikātabbā*, Pāt 6,2) means: [the offence] is to be made known ⁱ-in the midst of the Saṅgha, in the midst of the group, ⁱ-or in the presence of a single individual; at least it should be said to the bhikkhu who is next to him: ^j-“Friend, I have committed such-and-such an offence; [**17**] having risen from here,¹ I shall expiate that offence.”^{-j}

Even if he is doubtful, it should be said: ^k-“I am doubtful, friend, about such-and-such offence. When I become free from doubt, then I will expiate that offence.”^{-k}

In the [phrase] “For when [the offence] is revealed, it is good for him” (*āvikatā hi ‘ssa phāsu hoti*, Pāt 6,2), [the word “the offence] is revealed” (*āvikatā*, Pāt 6,2) has the meaning: when it is revealed, when it is made known. For, as in the case of *alajjitā* (“through shamelessness”), etc., this too is a nominative in the sense of an instrumental.²

[The word] “for” (*hi*, Pāt 6,2) is merely a particle.

For him (*assa*, Pāt 6,2) means: for that bhikkhu. ⟨27⟩

*It is good (phāsu hoti, Pāt 6,2) means: it is good for the attainment of the first *jhāna*, etc.; the meaning is: the path to happiness succeeds by virtue of the joy, etc., that is rooted in the absence of remorse.*

Thus, the commentary on the introduction of the Kañkhāvitaranī, the commentary on the Pātimokkha, is finished.

^{h-h}Vin I 104,11f. ⁱ⁻ⁱVin I 104,13f. ^{j-j}Vin I 126,25f. ^{k-k}Vin I 126,31ff.

¹ According to Kkh-nṭ 164.7, from the observance house.

² It seems that the commentator was not aware of the instr. ending in -ā.

⟨28⟩

Pārājika I M

55

[17] ⟨28⟩ [C. The Section of Rules Entailing Defeat]

[Here these four rules¹ entailing defeat² come up for recitation.

(Pāt 8,2)]

Now that which [comes] immediately after the introduction beginning [with the words] *here these four (tatr' ime cattāro, Pāt 8,2)* [is] the section of [rules entailing] defeat.³

There, *here (tatrā, Pāt 8,2)* means: in this Pātimokkha mentioned thus: *I shall recite the Pātimokkha* (Pāt 4,12).⁴

These (ime, Pāt 8,2) means: turning towards [the rules] now to be mentioned.

Four (cattāro, Pāt 8,2) means: the limit by counting.

Entailing defeat (pārājikā, Pāt 8,2) means: [the rules] named thus.

Rules (dhammā; Pāt 8,2) means: offences.⁵

Come up for recitation (uddesam āgacchanti, Pāt 8,2) means: the [rules] come up for being recited in their proper form, not as in the introduction with a mere general statement [such as] *for whom there may be an offence* (Pāt 4,14 = Vin I 103,2).

[1. The commentary on the first rule entailing defeat]

[1. Pār M: Whatever bhikkhu, [who has] undertaken the training and the way of life of the bhikkhus, having neither renounced the training nor declared [his] weakness, should engage in sexual intercourse, even [if it is] with a female animal, he becomes defeated (pārājika*) [and incurs] the loss of communal life (asamvāsa*).

(Pāt 18,4–7 = Vin III 23,33–36)]

Whatever (yo pana, Pāt 8,4) means: whoever in respect of a variety of characteristics, etc., such as long or short, etc.

¹ *dhamma*, translated by “matters” in Pāt 9,2, is also used in the meaning “rule”, see Geiger 1920: 16 (§II 1a) [1973: 115]; von Hinüber 2000a: 70 [2009: 255]; this fits the present context better.

² *pārājika**.

³ For a discussion of the four Pārājika rules in relation to the four *akaraṇīyas*, see von Hinüber 1999: 41–45.

⁴ Quoted and commented on above (Kkh 21,24ff, see p. 45).

⁵ The rule and the offence against that rule bear the same name.

56

Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat

⟨29⟩

Pana (Pāt 8,4) (untranslated) [is] a particle.

Bhikkhu (Pāt 8,4) means: one who is ordained by a procedure [with a decision as] the fourth [element] after [putting] the motion (*ñatti-catuttha-kamma-upasampadā**), indisputable, fit to stand, among the [following] eight [kinds of] ordinations:

- (1) a—the “come bhikkhu” ordination (*ehi bhikkhu-upasampadā**),
- (2) ordination by going to [the triple] refuge (*saranā-gamanūpa-sampadā**),
- (3) ordination by accepting the admonition (*ovāda-paṭiggaṇanūpa-sampadā**),
- (4) ordination by answering questions (*pañha-vyākaraṇūpasampadā**),
- (5) ordination by accepting the eight important rules,¹
- (6) ordination by messenger,²
- (7) ordination with eight pronouncements,³ [and]
- (8) ordination through a procedure [with a decision as] the fourth [element] after [putting] the motion.^{4-a}

The indisputable nature of that procedure [of ordination], moreover, is to be known by the complete suitability of

- (1) the subject matter (*vatthu*) [of that procedure] (i.e. the candidate),
- (2) the motion (*ñatti*), ⟨29⟩
- (3) the proclamation[s] (*anussāvana*),

a—aSp I 241,10–14

¹ This refers to the ordination of Mahā-Pajāpatī-Gotamī. See Vin II 255f. (BD V 354f.).

² This form of ordination was allowed for bhikkhunīs beginning with the case of the courtesan Aḍḍhakāśī. See Vin II 277 (BD V 383).

³ This is the usual procedure for the ordination of bhikkhunīs, who are ordained first by the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha and then by the Bhikkhu Saṅgha, both using a motion followed by three proclamations (two motions and two times three proclamations, eight pronouncements in all). See Sp I 242,10ff; III 660,17–20. The term seems to be first mentioned at Vin V 137,7; 213,10 (*aṭṭhayācikā upasampadā*) and is not a reference only to the ordination of a bhikkhunī through a messenger as suggested in BD VI 221, n. 9 (ad Vin I 137,7).

⁴ Ordination by a procedure [with a decision as] the fourth [element] after [putting] the motion (*ñatti-catuttha-kamma-upasampadā**) is the regular way for ordaining bhikkhus and has survived to the present day.

<29>

Pārājika I M

57

- | (4) the boundary (*sīmā*), and
- | (5) the assembly (*parisā*).

| There, (1) “subject matter [of that procedure]” (Kkh 28,24) means: the individual seeking ordination. He is to be known, setting aside

- | (1.1) someone who is less than twenty years old,
- | (1.2) someone who previously committed an extreme offence (*antima-vatthu*), and
- | (1.3–1.13) the eleven unqualified (*abhabba*) individuals starting with a eunuch (*pañdaka*).¹

| There, (1.1) “less than twenty years old” (Kkh 29,3) means: not having completed twenty years starting from his gaining rebirth (that is, conception).

| (1.2) “Someone who previously committed an extreme offence” (Kkh 29,3) means: someone who has previously committed one or other of the four [offences entailing] defeat.

| (1.3) [Those unqualified individuals] “starting with a eunuch” (*pañdaka*; Kkh 29,3) are mentioned in the section [of the Vinaya] on individuals to be avoided (*vajjaniya-puggala*).² Among them — setting aside³ (1.3.1) the “sprinkled” eunuch⁴ and (1.3.2) the “jealous” eunuch⁵ — (1.3.3) the eunuch by castration [of the testicles],⁶ (1.3.4) the

¹ The other ten kinds of unqualified persons are defined below (1.3 to 1.13).

² Vin I 85–90 (BD IV 108–14).

³ Since these two types of “eunuchs” can be ordained as novices (Sp V 1016,10f.; Vin-vn, v. 2521) as well as as bhikkhus (Sp V 1016,13–16), they are separated from the other types of eunuchs (see below, p. 73, n. 1).

⁴ *āsitta-pañdaka*, that is, one practising fellatio, Sp V 1016,1–3; cf. Perera 1993: 143; Cabezón 2017: 409.

⁵ *usūya-pañdaka*, that is, a voyeur, Sp V 1016,3ff. Similar to Skt *īrṣyāśaṇḍha* or *īrṣyaka*, cf. Perera 1993: 143; Cabezón 2017: 408.

⁶ *opakkamika-pañdaka*, see Sp V 1016,5f. Cabezón 2017: 409. A man whose penis has been cut off does not count as a eunuch (below, p. 73, n. 1), see Vmv II 119,4ff.: *bijāni apanñāti ti* (Sp V 1016,5) *vuttattā bijesu thitesu nimittamatte apanñe pañdako na hoti. bhikkhuno pi anābādhapaccayā tadapanayane thullaccayam eva, na pana pañdakattam*. “Because it has been taught [in the Samantapāsādikā, that the one whose] testicles have been removed [is a eunuch by surgery], therefore, if merely [his] male organ is removed, [but his] testicles remain with him, he is not a eunuch. Even for a monk, if his [penis] is

58 *Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat*

⟨29⟩

genderless eunuch,¹ and (1.3.5) the fortnightly eunuch during the fortnight he is a eunuch² are intended here.³

(1.4) Moreover, “the one in communion by theft” (*theyya-saṃvāsaka**) is threefold: (1.4.1) the b⁴-thief of the [outward] attribute [of a bhikkhu]⁴ (*liṅga-tthenaka*), (1.4.2) the thief of the communal life (*saṃvāsa-tthenaka*),⁵ (1.4.3) the thief of both (*ubhaya-tthenaka*).⁶

(1.4.1) There, whoever (i) has gone forth by himself, (ii) does not count his years as a bhikkhu,⁷ (iii) does not accept⁸ the veneration of bhikkhus and novices in accordance with age, [18] (iv) does not eject

b–b ≠ Sp V 1016,26–32

removed without this being caused by a disease, it is only a grave offence, but it is not the state of a eunuch.” Cf. Kieffer-Pülz 2013: III [Z 292] [1], especially n. 31.

¹ *napuṇsaka-paṇḍaka*, see Sp V 1016,8f.; cf. Perera 1993: 114f., 142f.; Cabezón 2017: 408.

² *pakkha-paṇḍaka*, see Sp V 1016,6ff.; cf. Perera 1993: 143; Cabezón 2017: 408.

³ These last three may not be ordained, and therefore are unqualified for entrance into the community.

⁴ For *liṅga* in this meaning, see Nolot 1999: 59, n. 8, who translates *liṅga* as “guise”. The *liṅga-tthenaka* ordains himself, wears the robe of a bhikkhu, but does not participate in the communal life (*saṃvāsa**; Sp V 1016,27–31).

⁵ *saṃvāsa** normally describes the communal life consisting in the joint performance of procedures, etc., but in the present context each type of activity connected with the counting of the years spent as a bhikkhu is meant, because on account of that one unlawfully takes one’s place in the communal life of a local community (Kkh 29,23f., Sp V 1017,3f.). Cf. Vjb 430,4f.: *saṃvāso ti c’ ettha na ekakammādiko samvāso, kin tu bhikkhuvassagānādiko kiriyabhedo idha saṃvāso nāma*. “And ‘communal life’ in this context does not mean the communal life consisting in one common procedure, etc., but here ‘communal life’ means each type of activity such as counting the years [spent] as a bhikkhu.” Cf. Sp V 1016,31–17,6.

⁶ Sp V 1016,25–17,12.

⁷ Counting the years since ordination presupposes ordination. If a man is not ordained and counts the years he has been a fake bhikkhu, he not only steals the outward attribute (*liṅga*), but also the communal life (*saṃvāsa**), because in doing this he is laying claim to a certain position within the hierarchy of the community.

⁸ Literally “enjoys”.

<29>

Pārājika I M

59

[others] from their seats, (v) is not engaged in the observance, etc.¹ — this one is called a “thief of the [outward] attribute” (*linga-tthenaka*) because he has stolen only the mere [outward] attribute by his state of impure thought.

But whoever is made to go forth by bhikkhus, while [still] being a novice,^{-b} removes his yellow robe[s and] — with the resolve to [put] these [robes on again]² — indulges in sexual intercourse, [then] puts on [his yellow robes] again [and] claims the status of a novice, this one is not a thief of the [outward] attribute, because he has not given up³ the [outward] attribute given [to him] by the bhikkhus, [and] neither is he a thief of communal life, because he has⁴ accepted the communal life that

¹ All these activities presuppose the counting of one’s age since ordination.

² *sa-ussāha* in general expresses the resolve of a bhikkhu who takes off his robes and maintains his legal claim to the robes. Even if a bhikkhu takes off his robes, he does not give up his legal status as a bhikkhu. This is clear from cases described in the Vinītavatthu section to the first Pārājika rule (Vin III 34,21–32), and made explicit in the commentary, Sp V 1019,30–20,3: *eko bhikkhu kāsāye sa-ussāho va odātam nivāsetvā methunam paṭisevitvā puna kāsāyāni nivāsetvā vassagaṇanādibhedam sabbam vidhiṃ āpajjati, ayam pi theyya-samvāsako na hoti, pabbajjāmattam labhati. sace pana kāsāye dhuram nikhipitvā odātam nivāsetvā methunam paṭisevitvā puna kāsāyāni nivāsetvā vassagaṇanādibhedam sabbam vidhiṃ āpajjati, theyyasamvāsako hoti.* “[If] a bhikkhu, in fact with the resolve to [his] yellow robe, dresses himself with a white cloth, engages in sexual intercourse, dresses himself again with [his] yellow robes, [and] then follows each rule, starting with counting the years [as a bhikkhu], etc., [then] he too is not one who is in communion by theft (since he committed a Pārājika offence and, therefore, is expelled). He [can] only receive ordination as a novice. If he, however, gives up his legal claim to the yellow robe, dresses himself with a white cloth, engages in sexual intercourse, dresses himself again with [his] yellow robes [and] then follows each rule starting with counting the years [as a bhikkhu], etc., [then] he is one in communion by theft.”

³ That is, he does not formally leave the status of a novice by formally giving up his clothes.

⁴ Kkh 29,18 adds *na*, which according to the edition is omitted only in C^e. Grammatically the construction *na ... sāditattā* is unlikely, but *asāditattā* would have been expected instead. However, the structure of the sentence as well as the meaning shows that *na* has to be omitted here. Kkh-nt (169,7ff.) and Pālim-nt (I 243,11ff.), which quote this sentence, also omit *na*.

60 *Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat*

⟨29⟩

accords with the [outward] attribute.¹

Exactly this method [applies] also to one who has committed an extreme offence.²

(1.4.2) And whoever, while [still]³ c—being a novice, goes to another country, counts [his pretended] years as a bhikkhu, enjoys veneration in accordance with [his pretended] age [of ordination],⁴ ejects [others] from their seats, engages in the observance, etc., this one is called a thief of communal life (*saṃvāsa-tthenaka*) because of stealing only the mere communal life. For, indeed, every sort of activity which begins with the counting of the years as a bhikkhu is to be understood as communal life (*saṃvāsa**)⁵ in this case.

Exactly the same method [applies] also to one who, having renounced the training, again acts in this way, [thinking], “No one knows me”.

(1.4.3) But whoever, after going forth on his own [and] going to a residence, enjoys veneration in accordance with [his pretended] age [of ordination], ejects [others] from their seats, counts [his] years as a bhikkhu, engages in the observance, etc., this one is called a thief of both (*ubhayatthenaka*) because he has stolen the outward attribute as well as the communal life.—c

c—c ≠ Sp V 1016,32–17,10

¹ Since he formally became a novice he is allowed to partake in the *saṃvāsa** of the respective Saṅgha in conformity with the status of a novice.

² This refers to bhikkhus who committed offences entailing defeat, but who neither stole the outward attribute nor the communal life (see Kkh-nṭ 169,3ff.). Cf. Sp V 1019,30–33 (see above, p. 59, n. 2), where we are told that such a bhikkhu receives only the ordination as a novice thereafter.

³ This passage, beginning above in 1.4.1, second paragraph, with the words “removes his yellow” (above, p. 59), has no counterpart in Sp. The state of a novice who takes off his robes and indulges in sexual intercourse, seems not to have been dealt with in Sp.

⁴ This meaning is clearly attested to by the parallel in Sp V 1016,32f.: *yo pana bhikkhūhi pabbājito sāmañero samāno pi videsañ gantvā “aham dasavasso vā vīsativasso vā” ti musā vatvā bhikkhuvassāni gaṇeti (...)*

⁵ Here, the counting of one’s pretended age of ordination is meant, since this provides one with a place in the hierarchy of a local community. In doing so, one behaves as if one is still a bhikkhu, even though one has formally left the Saṅgha, and in order to become a bhikkhu again one would have to be reordained.

⟨30⟩

Pārājika I M

61

Exactly the same method [applies] also to one who, having removed his robes by virtue of giving up [his] legal claim,¹ thereafter commits an extreme offence,² then having put the [robes] on again ⟨30⟩ acts in this way.

(1.4.4) All these three sorts of “one who is in communion by theft” are intended here; but the [following] three³ sorts are excepted:

^d—Whoever here takes the outward attribute [of a bhikkhu] either from fear of kings or famine or a desert⁴ or disease or enemies or for the sake of bringing robes [to bhikkhus], as long as he has a pure mind [and] does not enjoy the communal life [with bhikkhus], he is not called one who is in communion by theft.^{—d}

(1.5) But whoever being ordained, desiring the status of a member of another sect (*titthiya-bhāva*), either himself takes the outward attribute of a member of another sect (*titthiya-liṅga*), e.g. a garment made of *kusa* grass, etc.,⁵ [and]⁶ goes forth in their presence, or becoming naked,

^{d—d}Sp V 1017,14–17

¹ In this case, the yellow robes are not removed with the resolve to keep them (that is, to dress in them again), but with the intention of leaving the Saṅgha, but this alone does not constitute a withdrawal from the Saṅgha which is the reason why he then can commit an extreme offence thereafter.

² *antima-vatthu*. Identified as “extreme offence”, *BD* IV 159, n. 7, but without a reference to a text that says this. It is not defined in the canon, but only in later commentarial texts (*Vin-vn-t* I 43,8ff.: *pārājikāpanno puggalo, tassa vatthu antimabhāvassa kāraṇattā pārājikāpatti antimavatthū ti* (*Vin-vn* v. 34) *vuccati*).

³ The following stanza lists two types (if we follow the *vā*) or six (if we consider all the reasons given (that is, fear of kings, etc.)). It is unclear how a list of “three sorts” (*tividham*) given here in Kkh (also attested in Khuddas-nt 256,16) is to be related to this stanza.

⁴ Or “a desert with only little food” °*dubbhikkha-kantāra*°, compare Sp I 121,9 *dubbhikkhakantāram tāreti*; Nidd-a I 162,22f. = Paṭis-a II 439,23f. ≠ As 252,30–53,1: *dīṭṭhikantāro/°am corakantāra-vālakantāra-nirudakakantāra-dubbhikkha-kantārā*.

⁵ According to Kkh-nt 172,20f. “etc.” stands for *phalaka-kkhanḍa-jāṭādi* (“bark (?)”, strips [of hide] (?), tangled branches (?), etc.”; according to *Vin-vn-t* II 471,18f. it stands for *vākacīra-phalaka-cīrādi* (“[two types of] bark robe, etc.”)).

⁶ From the viewpoint of content *vā* (Kkh 30,9) should be omitted as is the case in S^c. We have two elements, first, one who takes a garment made of *kusa* grass, etc., and then is ordained by the respective group of non-Buddhist ascetics, and second, one who becomes naked and then is ordained in the Ājīvika community. If one reads *vā*, the taking of the garment made of *kusa*

62 *Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat*

⟨30⟩

goes to the Ājīvakas [and] then undertakes their vows, this one is called one who has gone to the members of another sect (*titthiya-pakkantaka*).

(1.6) Except, however, for humans, indeed, all the rest are called animals (*tiracchāna-gata*).

(1.7) Whoever deliberately deprives of life a human mother, himself being a human, indeed, this [one] is called a matricide (*mātu-ghātaka*).

(1.8) Exactly the same method [applies] also to a parricide (*pitu-ghātaka*).

(1.9) Whoever deliberately deprives of life¹ a human [being] whose taints are destroyed (i.e. an arahat), even one who remains in the outward attribute of a householder, this one is called an arahat killer (*arahanta-ghātaka*).

(1.10) But whoever violates a bhikkhunī of good standing² through any one of the three orifices,³ this one is called a violator of bhikkhunīs (*bhikkhunī-dūsaka*).

(1.11) ^eWhoever, like Devadatta, having established a teaching that is contrary to the doctrine and contrary to the discipline, splits a community by virtue of any one of the four procedures,⁴ this is one who splits a community (*saṅgha-bhedaka*).^{-e}

(1.12) ^fWhoever, like Devadatta, with evil intention, with the intention to kill, causes blood to flow from the living body of a Tathāgata, even the mere [amount that could be] drunk by a small fly, this one is called one who sheds the blood [of a Tathāgata] (*lohituppādaka*).^{-f} [19]

(1.13) Indeed, whoever has a twofold sexual organ, ^gboth⁵ because of a [volitional] act which produces female characteristics and because of a [volitional] act which produces male characteristics,^{6-g} this one is

^{e-e}Sp V 1024.8ff. ^{f-f}Sp V 1024.11-14 ^{g-g}Sp V 1024.18f.

grass and the ordination in the respective group would be alternatives.

¹ Kkh 30,15 *voropitā* with v.l. *voropito* (S^o). In fact B^e also reads *voropito* (not noted in Kkh), and this is the correct reading.

² That is, a bhikkhunī free from any offence or undergoing penance for an offence.

³ Euphemistic for mouth, vagina, and anus.

⁴ According to Kkh-nṭ 173,20f., Pāc-y 266,5f., Pālim-nṭ I 251,20f., Sp-t III 261,6, this refers to the four types of procedures (*apalokana*^o*, *ñatti*^o*, *ñatti-dutiya*^o* and *ñatti-catuttha-kamma**).

⁵ *ubhato*; Abhidh-av-nṭ (CSCD II 137), which also has a similar sentence, adds *ti* before *ubhato*.

⁶ Kkh 30,23: read *purisa-nimitt*^o for *purisa-nimmit*^o.

⟨31⟩*Pārājika I M*

63

| called a hermaphrodite (*ubhato-vyañjanaka*).

| Thus, there are thirteen¹ individuals who cannot be the subject matter
 | (i.e. a candidate) for [higher] ordination. But except for these, if there is
 | anyone else desiring ordination, the procedure of [higher] ordination is
 | indisputable by virtue of the complete suitability of the subject matter
 | (i.e. the candidate).

| (2) How is it (i.e. the procedure of higher ordination) indisputable by
 | virtue of the complete suitability of the motion (*ñatti*)? [There are], to
 | begin with, five defects of the motion:² not dealing with (*aparāmasana*)

- | (2.1) the subject matter (i.e. the candidate) (*vatthu*),
- | (2.2) the community (*saṅgha*),
- | (2.3) the individual (*puggala*),
- | (2.4) the motion (*ñatti*) and
- | (2.5) by placing the motion after [the proclamation] (*pacchā
ñatti-tthapanā*). ⟨31⟩

| (2.1) There, not announcing the one desiring [higher] ordination [by
 | means of] “This is so-and-so”, is called “not dealing with the subject
 | matter” (i.e. the candidate) (*vatthu-aparāmasana*).³

| (2.2) Not saying [the word] “community” after having said, “Rever-
 | end sir, listen to me”, here (i.e. in the phrase) “Reverend sir, let the com-
 | munity listen to me”, [this] is called “not dealing with the community”
 | (*saṅgha-aparāmasana*).⁴

| (2.3) Not announcing the preceptor [by means of] “This one desiring
 | [higher] ordination from so-and-so”⁵ is called “not dealing with the
 | individual” (*puggala-aparāmasana*).⁶

| (2.4) Not pronouncing the motion at all is called “not dealing with
 | the motion” (*ñatti-aparāmasana*).⁷

¹ These eleven individuals, together with one who is not twenty years of age and
 | one who has committed a grave offence.

² Cf. Vin V 220,25–29 for these five defects.

³ Cf. Sp VII 1397,35–98,6.

⁴ Cf. Sp VII 1398,6–9.

⁵ Shortened for *ayam itthannāmo itthannāmassa āyasmato upasampadāpekkho*
 | (Vin I 95,23f.), which is the expression in the motion (*ñatti*) of the formula
 | (*kamma-vācā**) for the higher ordination. For more details, see Appendix 12.

⁶ Cf. Sp VII 1398,9–15.

⁷ Cf. Sp VII 1398,15–20.

64

Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat

⟨31⟩

(2.5) Having finished the [subsequent] proclamation (*kamma-vācā*)¹ first, then having said, “This is the motion”,² [he says,] “It is pleasing to the community.”³ Announcing the motion thus is called “placing the motion after [the recitation of the subsequent proclamation]”⁴ (*pacchā ñatti-tthapanā*).⁵

Thus the [procedure for higher ordination that is] furnished with a motion which is free from these defects is indisputable by virtue of the complete suitability of the motion.

(3) Also, for the indisputable nature [of the procedure for higher ordination] by virtue of the proclamation (*anussāvana*) these are the five defects of the proclamation: not dealing with (*aparāmasana*)

- (3.1) the subject matter (*vatthu*; i.e. the candidate),
- (3.2) the community (*sāṅgha*),
- (3.3) the individual (*puggala*),
- (3.4) distortion (*hāpana*)⁶ of the recitation (*sāvana*),⁷ and
- (3.5) reciting at the wrong time (*akāle savana*).

(3.1–3.3) There, not dealing with the subject matter (*vatthu-aparāmasana*), etc., is exactly the same as spoken of [above] with respect to the motion. But wherever they (i.e. subject matter, community, and indivi-

¹ *kamma-vācā** here is a synonym of *anussāvanā**, which designates the single or threefold subsequent proclamation in the “formula for the procedure” (*kamma-vācā*; Nolot 1996: 86: “legal proposition”) following the motion, and does not refer to the formula (*kamma-vācā*) for the whole *upasampadā* act.

² Here the sentence “this is the motion”, which terminates the motion in the formula for higher ordination (Vin I 95.22), follows the proclamation (*anussāvanā* or *kamma-vācā*) instead of preceding it.

³ This is the last sentence of the formula for the procedure of higher ordination that terminates the resolution (cf. Vin I 95.33).

⁴ Kkh 31.7 for *pacchā ñatti-tthapanam* read *pacchā ñatti-tthapanam*.

⁵ Cf. Sp VII 1398,20–23.

⁶ German “Verstümmelung”. There are two ways in which the recitation can be distorted, by omitting words or syllables and by wrong pronunciation. For details cf. von Hinüber 1987: 104, 106 [English translation 1994: 202f., 204f.]

⁷ *sāvana*, according to von Hinüber 1987: 116: “Verkünden oder Sprechen der gesamten *kammavācā*”, may also refer to the proclamation of parts of this formula. Since we here deal with the defects of the *kamma-vācā** or *anussāvanā*, this must be kept in mind.

⟨31⟩*Pārājika I M*

65

|dual) are not dealt with in the three subsequent proclamations, only [this
|is meant as] “not dealing with” [in this connection].¹

| (3.4) Without speaking the proclamation (*kamma-vācā*) at all, how-
| ever, only announcing the motion four times or furthermore not pronounc-
| ing or mispronouncing a syllable or a word within the proclamation
| (*kamma-vācā* = *anussāvana*), [this] is called “distortion of the recitation”
| (*sāvanāya hāpana*).²

| (3.5) Performing the subsequent proclamation (*anussāvana*) at the
| wrong place in the recitation, without having put the motion first, [this]
| is called “recitation at the wrong time” (*akāle sāvana*).³

| Thus, the [procedure for higher ordination] furnished with a sub-
| sequent proclamation which is free from these defects is indisputable by
| virtue of the complete suitability of the subsequent proclamation.

| (4) Now, moreover, [the procedure for higher ordination] performed
| within a boundary (*sīmā*) which avoids the previously mentioned char-
| acteristics of wrong boundaries⁴ is indisputable by virtue of the com-
| plete suitability of the boundary.⁵

| (5) But the [following] are the three defects in an assembly (*parisā*):

| (5.1) the non-arrival of as many bhikkhus as are fit [to act] in the
| procedure (*kamma-ppatta*),⁶

| (5.2) not bringing the consent (*chanda*) of those who deserve to
| give [their] consent,⁷

¹ Cf. Sp VII 1398,26–99,3.

² Cf. Sp VII 1399,3–400,35.

³ Cf. Sp VII 1400,36–401,2.

⁴ See above, pp. 14ff. (Kkh 6,20–8,11).

⁵ Cf. Sp VII 1401,3–34; see Kieffer-Pülz 1992: A 11.2.1–11.2.9.

⁶ For this term, see Nolot 1996: 75f., n. 3; CPD s.v. *kamma-ppatta*. All the
qualified bhikkhus within the same boundary should come to participate in the
procedures. If they do not, the Saṅgha is incomplete, even if the number of
bhikkhus would suffice to constitute a quorum.

⁷ Bhikkhus who are within the boundary where a Saṅgha wants to perform a
saṅgha-kamma have to attend this *saṅgha-kamma*, or, if they are not able to
participate, they must send their consent. If it is an observance day, they must
send their declaration of purity as well as their consent.

66

Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat

⟨31⟩

(5.3) the protest (*paṭikkosana*)¹ of those who are present face to face.

[The procedure for higher ordination] performed by an assembly which is free from these [defects] is indisputable by virtue of the complete suitability of the assembly.²

But because it deserves to be a valid base,³ and because it deserves [to be considered as] the teacher's teaching, [such a procedure of higher ordination] deserves to stand.

Thus, whoever is ordained through the procedure of the [higher] ordination [consisting of] a *ñatti-catuttha* [procedure],⁴ which in this way is indisputable, fit to stand — this one is intended as “bhikkhu” here (i.e. in Pār I M).

In the [Pātimokha rules, classified as] “fault[s] according to a precept [laid down by the Buddha]”,⁵ however, other [bhikkhus] are also included.⁶

¹ *paṭikkosana* is the protest of at least four bhikkhus against a procedure performed by the Saṅgha (Vin I 115,2–11), but it is also used for the protest of a single bhikkhu in the Parivāra (Vin V 183,24); see Kieffer-Pülz 1992: A 11.4. It is only allowed if a bhikkhu is within the same boundary as the Saṅgha who performs the *sangha-kamma* against which the protest is directed (Vin I 321,7ff., 20; Kieffer-Pülz 1992: A 8.6.2).

² Cf. Sp VII 1401,34–402,9.

³ *kāraṇārahattā*. *Kāraṇa* is also used in the sense of *karana*, “performance”, and the present statement is interpreted accordingly (Nolot 1996: 90, n. 35: “it is sanctioned as ‘fit to stand’ in relation to its performance and to the Buddha’s teaching”).

⁴ *ñatti-catuttha-kamma-upasampadā**.

⁵ *pannatti-vajja*. For details, see Appendix 13.

⁶ This refers to people who became bhikkhus by other types of higher ordination than the *ñatti-catuttha-kamma-upasampadā**, e.g., the “come bhikkhu” ordination (*ehi-bhikkhu-upasampadā**), the ordination consisting in taking the three-fold refuge (*saraṇa-gamanūpasampadā**), the ordination by accepting the admonition of the Buddha (*ovāda-paṭiggahanūpasampadā**), and the ordination consisting in answering questions (*pañha-vyākaraṇūpasampadā**). All the respective persons attained arahatship, that is, they were highest type of *ariyas*, and therefore were incapable of committing offences violating rules classified as *loka-vajja*, but only those classified as *pannatti-vajja* according to Sp-ṭ (II 57,5–58,10). Deviating from this, Vmv (I 129,28–30,7) claims that these persons

⟨32⟩*Pārājika I M*

67

⟨32⟩ [One who has] undertaken the training and the way of life of the bhikkhus (*bhikkhūnam sikkhāsājīvasamāpanno*, Pāt 8,4) means: whatever training of the bhikkhus is called the higher moral conduct (*adhisīla*),¹ this [training]; and wherever ^hthey live together, are living together² (*ekājīvīkā*), having a shared livelihood (*sabhāga-vuttino*),^{3–h} [20] this way of life is called the code of training prescribed by the Blessed One; [the one who has] undertaken [this training and this life] conforming with the training there, [is one who has] undertaken the training and the way of life of the bhikkhus.⁴

[One who has] undertaken (*saṃapanno*, Pāt 8,4) means: as one who has become one who fulfils the training and does not transgress the way of life [of the bhikkhus], he has attained both of these.

Having neither renounced the training nor declared [his] weakness (*sikkham apaccakkhāya dubbalyam anāvikatvā*, Pāt 8,5) means: whatever training he has undertaken, not rejecting that, and whatever way of life he has undertaken, not declaring [his] weakness in respect of that.⁵ There, knowing the renunciation of the training by virtue of [six factors, i.e.] (1) the intention (*citta*), (2) the key [words] (*khetta*), (3) the tense (*kāla*), (4) the action (*payoga*), (5) the individual (*puggala*), and (6) the understanding (*vijñāna*), by the absence of these [six factors] the absence of the renunciation of the training is to be understood. How?

^{h–h}Sp I 245,19f.

are able to commit offences classified as *pañmatti-vajja* and light offences (all except Pārājika and Saṅghādisesa offences) classified as *loka-vajja*. From this follows that these persons cannot be included in the definition of *bhikkhu* of Pār I M.

¹ See Juo-hsueh 2000: 407 “moral training on a higher level”. Nyanatiloka 1976: s.v. *sikkhā*: “hohe Sittlichkeitsschulung (*adhi-sīla-sikkhā*)”. Juo-hsueh, based on the commentary on the Ānguttara-nikāya, states that *adhisīla* comprises *pañca-sīla*, *dasa-sīla*, and *catu-pārisuddhi-sīla*.

² Or: “are [persons] of a joint livelihood”.

³ *eka-jīvīkā* and *sabhāga-vuttino* are used as synonyms. Sp V 977,¹⁴ explains *sabhāga-vuttino* (v.l. °*vuttika*) by *sabhāga-jīvīkā*.

⁴ Kkh 32,5 add a full stop after *sājīvasamāpanno*. The sentence ends here.

⁵ Described in detail at Vin III 24,23–26,31 (BD I 43ff.; a discussion of what constitutes a declaration of weakness with the training not being renounced); and Vin III 27,27–28,7 (BD I 46f.; a discussion of when the training is not renounced).

68 *Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat*

⟨32⟩

(1) For only with the intention (*citta*) [consisting] in the desire to drop out of the status of being ordained does the renunciation of the training become [valid], not for one speaking in haste¹ or with stumbling speech.² Thus, the renunciation of the training becomes [valid] by virtue of intention (*citta*), not by its absence.

(2) Similarly there is renunciation of the training for one saying one or other of the [following] twenty-two key words — whichever he wants to say — or a synonym of them,³

(2.1) saying the fourteen [key words] starting with “Buddha” being taught as follows:⁴

- (2.1.1) “I renounce the Buddha”,
- (2.1.2) “I renounce the Dhamma”,
- (2.1.3) “I renounce the Saṅgha”,
- (2.1.4) “... the training”,
- (2.1.5) “... the discipline”,
- (2.1.6) “... the Pātimokha”,
- (2.1.7) “... the recitation”,
- (2.1.8) “... [my] preceptor”,
- (2.1.9) “... [my] teacher”,
- (2.1.10) “... [my] co-resident (pupil)⁵”,
- (2.1.11) “... [my pupil] who dwells nearby”,⁶
- (2.1.12) “... the one who has the same preceptor”,⁷
- (2.1.13) “... the one who has the same teacher”,
- (2.1.14) “I renounce [my] companions in the holy life”;

¹ That is, , inconsiderately, or “in jest” (*davā*). For more details, see Appendix 14.

² *rava*, for more details, see Appendix 15.

³ It is possible to renounce with the exact wording given below or to use synonyms, for instance, *sammā-sambuddha-putto* for *asakya-puttiyo* (Sp I 254,14f.). This is dealt with in detail at Sp I 251,10–54,19.

⁴ Cf. Vin III 26,34–27,5 (BD I 45f.).

⁵ *saddhivihārika*, which designates the pupil of an *upajjhāya* (“preceptor”).

⁶ *antevāsika*, which designates the pupil of an *ācariya* (“teacher”).

⁷ BD I 45 “the preceptor of my fellows”; BD IV 432 “fellow-preceptor”; BD VI 125 “one who has the same preceptor”. As Sp I 253,6–11 shows, *samānā-pajjhāyakam* refers to another *bhikkhu* who has the same preceptor (*upajjhāya*) as the bhikkhu who renounces his *upajjhāya*. The same is valid for *samānā-cariyaka*. Cf. Sp-ṭ III 343,10ff. = Pālim-ṇṭ II 322,22–25 (definition of *samānā-cariyaka*).

⟨33⟩*Pārājika I M*

69

(2.2) and [saying] the eight [key words] beginning with “a householder” being taught as follows:¹

- (2.2.1) “Accept me as a householder”,
- (2.2.2) “... a layman”,
- (2.2.3) “... a monastery attendant” (*ārāmika**),
- (2.2.4) “... a novice”,
- (2.2.5) “... a member of another sect”,
- (2.2.6) “... the disciple of a member of another sect”,
- (2.2.7) “... not a [true] recluse”,²
- (2.2.8) “accept me as not a son of the Sakyans.”

[The renunciation of the training does] not become [valid] for one renouncing [the training] by taking the name of one or another of trees, etc. Thus, renunciation [of the training] becomes [valid] by virtue of the “key [word]” (*khetta*), not by the absence of this.

(3) There, present tense phrases which are formulated thus: “I renounce”³ or “Accept me”,⁴ and the four phrases beginning with “Enough [of the Buddha] for me”, which are formulated combining [them] with the previous fourteen [key] words, without specifying the tense by a finite verb in this way: “Enough of the Buddha for me”, ... “What is the use of the Buddha to me?”, ... ⟨33⟩ “I have no need of the Buddha”, ... “I am well released from the Buddha”, etc.; by virtue of these only and of [their] synonyms does renunciation [of the training] become [valid].

[The renunciation] does not become valid for one saying phrases indicating the past or the future, such as, “I renounced” or “I shall renounce” or “You accepted me” or “You will accept me” or “What if I were to renounce?” Thus, renunciation [of the training] becomes [valid] by virtue of [the use of] the present tense (*kāla*) or by virtue of the tense being unspecified, not by the absence of these.

¹ Cf. Vin III 27.5–9 (BD I 46).

² *asamana*; according to Sp I 254.8–14 this is used in the sense of *dussīlo*, *pāpā-dhammo*, etc.

³ This is the verb combined with the previous fourteen key words; see above, p. 68.

⁴ This is the verb connected with the latter eight key words; see above.

(4) The action (*payoga*), however, is twofold: physical and verbal. There, the renunciation [of the training] becomes [valid] only through a verbal action having made a speech in any language in this way: “I renounce the Buddha”, etc. [The renunciation does] not become [valid] for someone making a physical action, [consisting in] writing syllables, or in showing hand gestures, etc. Thus, renunciation [of the training] becomes [valid] by reason of verbal action only, not by the absence of this.

(5) Now the individual (*puggala*) is twofold: the one who renounces [the training] and [the one] to whom he renounces [it]. There, the renunciation of the training becomes [valid] if whoever renounces [the training] is not someone who is insane,¹ someone whose thoughts are deranged,² or someone who is afflicted by pain; [21] and if the one to whom he renounces [it] is a human, but is not someone who is insane, etc., and is face to face [with him].³ For the declaration by messenger or by a letter of one who is absent does not become valid. Thus, renunciation [of the training] becomes [valid] by virtue of the individuals as mentioned, not by the absence of these.

(6) Understanding (*vijānana*) too is twofold by virtue of being determined or not determined. There, determining him or them, he says, “I declare [it] to him or to them.” If they, after hearing the utterance as men do normally in the world, understand [it] at the time of giving [their] attention [to it; if] they understand thus — in fact, immediately following his utterance — his⁴ having renounced the training by way of [saying], “This one is fed up [with the life as a bhikkhu]” or [by saying], “This one desires [to resume] the status of a householder”,ⁱ [then] training is indeed renounced. Further, if [only] later they understand it

ⁱ⁻ⁱSp I 250,4ff.

¹ Kkh 33,15 *ummattaka* should be written as a compound with the following *khittacitta*°.

² *khitta-citta* means that the respective person’s normal consciousness does not work, at least temporarily. In Sp *khitta-citta* is explained by *yakkhumattaka* (Sp I 269,30–70,10). Cf. Kieffer-Püllz 2013: I [Z 29], esp. nn. 22, 24.

³ These are based on the passage about how the renunciation is not valid, Vin III 27,27–28,7 (BD I 46f.).

⁴ The full stop after *tassa* (Kkh 33,24) should be deleted.

⟨34⟩

Pārājika I M

71

⟨34⟩ having thought, “What did this one say?” (or, “What was said through this?”), or if others¹ understand [it], the training is indeed not renounced.⁻ⁱ For one, however, who declares [his renunciation] without having determined [some person] beforehand, the training is indeed renounced if some human being according to the manner taught [above]² understands the meaning of [his] utterance. Thus, by virtue of understanding, the renunciation becomes [valid], not by the absence of this. But whoever renounces the training, even so much as in fun,³ the training is indeed not renounced by him.⁴

Thus, by not renouncing [the training] through the [six factors] which are of the nature described [above], beginning with “intention”, or by not renouncing it at all, [one] has not renounced the training (Pāt 8,5), and not declared a certain weakness (Pāt 8,5) which is the cause of renouncing the training.

Should engage in sexual intercourse (methunam dhammam patiseveyya, Pāt 8,5–6): Here sexual intercourse (*methunam dhammam*) means: the state of both [persons] being similar through being possessed by passion.⁵ *Should engage in*⁶ (*patiseveyya*) means: should engage in, should commit [an offence].

¹ That is, persons who were not determined by the speaker.

² See the definition of the individual to whom one renounces (Kkh 33,16f.; above, p. 70).

³ *davāya* here is explained as meaning “in fun” by Kkh-nṭ 182,19 (ad Kkh 34,4: *davāya pī ti kīlādhippāyena pī*), though Kkh-nṭ explained *davā* in Kkh 32,12 by *sahasā* (Kkh-nṭ 179,1f.). Compare Appendix 14.

⁴ For renunciation to become valid, six factors are required. The sentence referring to one who renounces just in fun follows immediately after the statement that renunciation comes to be valid by virtue of understanding, not by its absence” (Kkh 34,3f.: *evam vijānānavasena paccakkhānam hoti, na tadabhāvena*). For one who renounces the training only in fun, but in accordance with the required factors, the renunciation should become valid if we follow the preceding sentence blindly. But because of the sixth factor, that is, the required understanding of the one in whose presence the training is renounced, it does not become valid, since, if he really understands it, he also has to understand that this renunciation was done just in fun. This is why the author here says “so much as in fun” (Kkh 34,4: *antamaso davāya pī*).

⁵ For another definition cf. Vin III 28,8ff. (BD I 47,21–24).

⁶ Cf. Vin III 28,11f. (BD I 47,25–28).

72 *Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat*

〈34〉

j—*Even (antamāso, Pāt 8,6) means: in the least degree.*

Even [if it is] with a female animal (tiracchānagatāya pi, Pāt 8,6) means: even with a female who has arrived among the animals by virtue of rebirth.^{1—j} This [is] the supplementary prescription here.²

k—*He becomes defeated (pārājiko hoti, Pāt 8,7) means: he becomes defeated (alternative form), he has arrived at defeat.*^{3—k}

[*He incurs] the loss of communal life (asamvāso, Pāt 8,7) means:* bhikkhus of good standing dwell together here, [insofar as] the threefold mode of life beginning with having one common procedure⁴ is called “communal life”. He, for whom this does not exist, [is one, who incurs] the loss of communal life.⁵ For in procedures of the community, this one also [does] not [function as] one who completes the quorum.

This, thus far, is the explanation of the words.

But the [following] is the regulation in that connection:

There are three [sorts of] female by virtue of the human, non-human, [and] animal [females]. In consequence of each of them [having] three [orifices]: the orifice for faeces, the orifice for urine, and the orifice of the mouth, [there are altogether] nine orifices. Likewise, [this is the same] for hermaphrodites.⁶ But for males, in consequence of each of them [having] two [orifices]: the orifice for faeces, [and] the orifice of the mouth, [there are altogether] six orifices. Likewise [this is the same]

j—j Sp I 258,20f. k—k Sp I 259,17

¹ For another definition cf. Vin III 28,13ff. (BD I 47,29–48,3).

² The supplementary prescription has been strengthened as against the first prescription (*paññatti*) by adding the words *antamaso tiracchānagatāya pi*, commented on here. For the system of *paññatti*, *anupaññatti*, etc., see von Hinüber 1995a: 16f.

³ For another definition cf. Vin III 28,16–19 (BD I 48). According to von Hinüber 1995a: 9 [2009: 190] n. 9, “the correct interpretation of *pārājika* may be preserved at Vin V 148,15* quoted Sp 260,3–5”.

⁴ The three components which constitute *saṃvāsa** are one common procedure (*eka-kammaṇi*), one common recitation (*ekuddeso*), and the same training (*sama-sikkhātā*). In order to be able to perform these together, the monks have to be free from any offences.

⁵ See the similar explanation in Vin III 28,20–23 (BD I 48).

⁶ That is, there are three types of hermaphrodites (human, non-human, animal), each type having three orifices.

⟨35⟩*Pārājika I M*

73

for eunuchs.¹ In this way [there are altogether] thirty orifices.

Whatever bhikkhu with the intention [of having] sexual intercourse, causes his sexual organ,² either covered or not covered, to enter — even for a distance as small as one sesame seed — into the wet place not touched by natural wind of whichever [orifice] among these [thirty orifices], whether it be his own or that of others, whether it is covered or not covered — [in the case of orifices] of others, however, even of dead ones, of an [orifice] not decayed for the most part or not decayed [at all] — ⟨35⟩ or if [the bhikkhu's sexual organ] is made to enter [into such places] by someone else, [then if the bhikkhu] enjoys³ any [aspect of] entering, having entered, remaining, or withdrawing [his sexual organ], he is called one who commits an offence entailing defeat.

This so far is the regulation specific to [this rule]⁴ (*asādharanavinicchaya*).

But for the regulation common to all the rules of training the [following] is the list (*mātikā*): [22]

- (1) (1) the provenance (*nidāna*), (2) the individual (*puggala*), (3) the subject matter (*vatthu*), and, in fact, (4) the type of prescription (*paññatti*),

¹ *pañdaka*; the word “eunuch”, for the want of a better word, chosen as a translation for *pañdaka* here, covers a narrower range of phenomena than the word *pañdaka*. In the Vinaya, *pañdaka* stands for a being without sexual organs (neither male nor female). This results from the systematic followed in the frame of the first Pārājika, where men, women, eunuchs (neither men nor women), and hermaphrodites (men as well as women) in the states of existences as human beings, non-human beings, and animals are differentiated in order to cover all sorts of beings (for instance Vin III 28,23–37). In the commentarial layer *pañdaka* then is defined in a way that it also includes sexual deviants; and accordingly, the regulations regarding their ordination, etc., are differentiated. For further information, see Kieffer-Püllz 2013: III [Z 292]; Anālayo 2017: 309–13 (Appendix 1: *Pañdaka*); Cabezón 2017: chapters 6 and 7 (see also Index s.v. queer people).

² *aṅgajāta* is used for the sexual organ of both sexes.

³ *sādiyati* literally means “to enjoy”; enjoying is the visible sign (to be heard or seen), and enjoyment is defined as acceptance; from the commentarial layer onward, *sādiyati* is also used in the sense “to agree”. For a discussion of the usage and older literature, see Kieffer-Püllz 2013: I 424, n. 7.

⁴ That is, Pār I M. This regulation is not shared (*asādharana*) by Bhikkhunīs.

74

Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat

⟨35⟩

- (5) the command (*āṇatta*), (6) the [sort of] offence (*āpatti*) and
 (7) the non-offence (*anāpatti*), (8) the failure (*vipatti*), and more-
 over (9) the constituent factor (*aṅga*),
- (2) (10) the sort of origin (*samuṭṭhāna*), the variety according to
 (11) the activity (*kiriya*), (12) awareness (*saññā*), and (13) the
 intention (*citta*),
 the diversity of (14) faults (*vajja*) and (15) deeds (*kamma*); and
 likewise, the sort of (16–17) the pair of triads (*tika*)
- (3) Having recognized this characteristic consisting of seventeen
 parts, which is common [to all of the rules],
 a wise man will connect it [with the rules] here and there as it
 conforms [to them].

There, (1) “the provenance” (*nidāna*; Kkh 35.8) means: by virtue of Vesāli, Rājagaha, Sāvathi, Ālavi, Kosambi, Sakka, and Bhagga, the place of the [proclamation of the] prescription [is] sevenfold. For these [sevenfold places] are the provenance for all the rules of training.

(2) “The individual” (*puggala*; Kkh 35.8) means: with reference to whomever this or that rule of training¹ was prescribed.

(3) The misconduct of any given individual is called “the subject matter” (*vatthu*) (Kkh 35.8).

(4) “Type of prescription” (*paññatti-vidhi*; Kkh 35.8) means the ninefold prescription by virtue of

- (4.1) a—the prescription (*paññatti*),
- (4.2) the supplementary prescription (*anupaññatti*),
- (4.3) the prescription [for a case] that has not yet arisen (*anuppanna-paññatti*),²
- (4.4) the prescription [that applies] everywhere (*sabbattha-paññatti*),
- (4.5) the prescription [that applies] in [a border] region (*padesa-paññatti*),³

^a—^aVin V 1,7–10

¹ The rules of the Pātimokha are designated as *sikkhāpada*. We render this with “rule of training” or simply with “rule”.

² Refers to the eight *garu-dhammas*.

³ Here, *padesa* stands for *sabba-paccantima janapada*, “all border countries” (see Vin I 197,19 [BD IV 266]). Cf. p. 9, n. 40.

⟨35⟩*Pārājika I M*

75

- (4.6) the prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (*sādhāraṇa-paññatti*),
- (4.7) the prescription exclusive [to either bhikkhus or bhikkhunīs] (*asādhāraṇa-paññatti*),
- (4.8) the prescription for one [of the Saṅghas] (*ekato-paññatti*), and
- (4.9) the prescription for both [Saṅghas] (*ubhato-paññatti*).^a

There, (4.3) “the prescription [for a case] that has not yet arisen” means it is prescribed when a fault has not arisen. That [type of prescription] has come down [by tradition] only for bhikkhunīs by virtue of the acceptance of the eight important rules.¹ It does not exist elsewhere.

(4.5) The prescription [that applies] in [a border] region is fourfold by virtue of the [following four regulations]:

- (4.5.1) ^{b-a} a bhikkhu’s ordination by a group [of five bhikkhus] with an expert in the discipline as the fifth [member of the group],²
- (4.5.2) the [use of leather] footwear with many linings,³
- (4.5.3) regular bathing,⁴ and
- (4.5.4) the [use of] leather coverings.^{5-b}

For only in the middle region is there an offence because of these.⁶ Among all these [prescriptions that apply in a border region] only the mere rejection of constant bathing⁷ has come down in the Pātimokkha (Pāc 57

^a b-b Sp VII 1302,24f.

¹ The rules accepted by Mahā-Pajāpati Gotamī when the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha was established. See Vin II 256f. (BD V 352–56).

² Cf. Vin I 197,18f. (BD IV 266).

³ Cf. Vin I 197,33f. (BD IV 266).

⁴ Cf. Vin I 197,35f. (BD IV 266).

⁵ Cf. Vin I 198,4ff. (BD IV 267); *camma* is specified there as meaning the skins of sheep, goat, and deer.

⁶ For the boundaries of the middle region, see p. 9, n. 3. The exceptions for border regions concerning ordination, bathing, and leather coverings were allowed by the Buddha in response to a request made by Soṇa Kuṭīkaṇṇa, who was instructed to do so by his teacher Mahā-Kaccāna. See Vin I 194,9–98,10 (BD IV 260–67).

⁷ C^e reads *dhuvanahāna-paṭikkhepamattam eva*, the variant chosen for the translation above. This reading stresses the fact that the rejection of constant bathing is the only *padesa-paññatti* handed down in the Pātimokkha. The reading chosen by the editors for the main text of the edition (*dhuvanhānam pati-*

76

Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat

⟨36⟩

M (Pāt 66f.); Pāc 138 N (Pāt 208f.). ⟨36⟩ A prescription different from that [applying] in [a border] region does not exist. Each [of the others] is indeed “a prescription [that applies] everywhere” (4.4).

The pair of prescriptions in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs or exclusive to either bhikkhus or bhikkhunīs] (4.6, 4.7) and the pair of prescriptions for one Sangha [or for both Sanghas] (4.8, 4.9) are one in meaning. Therefore, excluding the prescription [for a case] that has not yet arisen (4.3) and the pair of prescriptions [that apply] everywhere [and that apply in a border region] (4.4, 4.5) and the pair of prescriptions for one Sangha [and both Sanghas] (4.7, 4.8), the regulation is to be understood throughout by virtue of the remaining four prescriptions (4.1, 4.2, 4.5, 4.9).¹

“(5) Command, (6) [sort of] offence and (7) non-offence, (8) failure” (Kkh 35,9):

Here (5) “command” (*āṇatta*) is called ordering;²

(6) “[sort of] offence” (*āpatti*) means: type of offence by virtue of “action preceding [the main action]” (*pubba-payoga*), etc.³

(7) “non-offence” (*anāpatti*) means: non-offence (i.e. acquittal) by virtue of ignorance, etc.⁴

kkhepamattam eva) — which is also the reading of the *pratīka* in the new commentary on the Kkh (Kkh-nṭ 187,13) — would stress that “constant bathing is only rejected”. Nevertheless, Kkh-nṭ 187,13f. explains *dhuvanhānam paṭikkhepamattam eva* as *niccanahānappatiṣedhanam eva* which corresponds exactly to our translation above.

¹ That is, only these four are applied in practice: the prescription (*paiññatti*), the supplementary prescription (*anupaññatti*), the prescription [that applies] in [a border] region (*desapaññatti*), and the prescription for both [Sanghas] (*ubhatopaññatti*).

² Kkh 36,6 read *āṇāpanā* for *āṇāpannā*.

³ Actions accompanying theft are divided in “actions preceding [the main action] (that is, the theft)” (*pubba-payoga*), and “actions [committed] together with [the main action]” (*saha-payoga*). *Pubba-payoga* are, for instance, actions such as searching for instruments, for an accomplice, etc. *Saha-payoga* are, for instance, excavating goods deposited in the earth (Sp II 310,3ff.). For more details, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I [Z38] [2]; [Z 39], esp. nn. 1, 7.

⁴ This refers to the various reasons for acquittal in the *anāpatti* formula to each Pātimokha rule. In all cases, which are classified as an “intentional type [of offence]” (*sacittaka*), a person is protected by ignorance or lacking awareness.

⟨36⟩*Pārājika I M*

77

(8) “Failure” (*vipatti*) means:¹ One or other of the failures in virtuous conduct (*sīla-vipatti*),² [right] behaviour (*ācāra-vipatti*),³ [right] view (*ditṭhi-vipatti*),⁴ or [right] livelihood (*ājīva-vipatti*).⁵

Thus the regulation is to be understood throughout by virtue of these [factors], too, which begin with “command” (5).

(9) “Constituent factor” (*anṅga*; Kkh 35,9) means: with respect to all rules of training the constituent factor for the offences must be known.⁶

(10) “The sort of origin” (*samuṭṭhāna*; Kkh 35,10) means: all offences have the [following] six origins:

- (10.1) body (*kāya*);
- (10.2) speech (*vācā*);
- (10.3) body and speech (*kāya-vācā*);
- (10.4) body and thought (*kāya-cittam*);
- (10.5) speech and thought (*vācā-cittam*);
- (10.6) body, speech, and thought (*kāya-vācā-cittam*)

which may have

- (i) one constituent factor (*ekaṅgika*, 10.1, 10.2),
- (ii) two constituent factors (*dvaṅgika*, 10.3, 10.4, 10.5) or
- (iii) three constituent factors (*tivaṅgika*, 10.6),

and which are also called “the origins of the rules of training” (*samuṭṭhāna*).

¹ Three types of failure are listed at Vin I 172,8–11 (*ājīvavipatti* is missing there); Vin V 92,8f. lists the same four as here.

² According to Vin I 172,8f. (BD IV 225) this means being guilty of one of the four offences entailing defeat or an offence that entails a formal meeting of the Saṅgha.

³ Vin I 172,9ff. (BD IV 225) says this means being guilty of a grave offence (*thullaccaya*), an offence entailing expiation (*pācittiya*), an offence entailing confession (*pātidesanīya*), an offence of wrong doing (*dukkata*), or an offence of wrong speech (*dubhāsita*).

⁴ Vin I 172,11 (BD IV 226) says this means wrong view (*micchā-ditṭhi*) or views involving extreme views (*antaggāhikā ditṭhi*).

⁵ Sp VII 1303,15 (= Kkh-nṭ 187,27f.) declares that six rules of training, having livelihood as their cause, fall under *ājīva-vipatti*. Vin V 99,5–16 describes these rules: (1) Pār 4 M/N; (2) Sgh 5 M/7 N; (3) Thullaccaya offence within Pār 4 M/N (Vin III 99); (4) Pāc 39 M; (5) Pāt 1–8 N; (6) Sekh 37.

⁶ That is, the factors necessary to constitute an offence. For instance, in cases of non-intentional types (*acittaka*) of offences, “intention” (*citta*) is not a factor (*anṅga*; Sp 270,27ff.), cf. Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I [Z 25].

78

Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat

⟨36⟩

There, the first three are not [dependent on] intention (*acittaka*); the last three are [dependent on] intention (*sacittaka*). Among them the offences originate having one or two or three or four or six origins. There is no [offence] that has five origins.

There, [an offence] with one origin originates because of the fourth or fifth or sixth [type] of origin, not because of another one. [An offence] with two origins [23] originates because of the first and fourth [types of] origin and because of the second and fifth, and the third and sixth, and the fourth and sixth, and the fifth and sixth [types of origin], not because of others. [An offence] with three origins originates because of the first three and because of the last three [types of] origins, not because of others. [An offence] with four origins originates because of the first, third, fourth, and sixth [types of] origin and the second, third, fifth and sixth [types of origin], not because of others. One with six origins originates because of all six origins.

Thus:

c—[Offences] with one origin are of three kinds. [Offences] that originated by two [origins] are of five kinds. [Offences] with the state (*ṭhāna*) of three and four origins are of two kinds. [An offence that] originated by six [origins] is of one kind.^{1—c}

By virtue of origin there are thirteen [different types of] offences in all.² They have acquired thirteen names on account of [their] origin by virtue of that rule of training, which is the first prescription [of the respective type of origination]:³

c—cUtt-vn v. 335

¹ This summarizes the classification of the origination (*samuṭṭhāna*) mentioned above, pp. 77f.

² All offences originate according to one of these thirteen origins. The “Summary of Origins” chapter (Vin V 86,1–90,5) enumerates these thirteen types of origins, and assigns every rule of the Pātimokha to its respective origin, in listing at times one word from each rule. These single words are identified in the translation (BD VI 123–31). Cf. von Hinüber 1992a: 58.

³ In Kkh these thirteen origins are indicated by a key word which represents the first rule of this type of origination. The system of Sp deviates in some points as indicated by von Hinüber 1992a: 62f.

Page 127 job: 1272818

⟨37⟩ *Pārājika I M* 79

- (i) [an offence] having the origin of the first [rule entailing] defeat (*paṭhama-pārājika*),¹
- (ii) [an offence] having the origin of [the rule about] taking what is not given (*adinnādāna*),²
- (iii) ... a go-between (*sañcaritta*),³
- (iv) ... admonition (*samanubhāsana*),⁴
- (v) ... the *kaṭhina*,⁵
- (vi) ... sheep's wool (*elakaloma*),⁶
- (vii) ... the doctrine word by word (*padaso-dhamma*),⁷
- (viii) ... journeying (*addhāna*),⁸ ⟨37⟩
- (ix) ... a caravan of thieves (*theyya-sattha*),⁹
- (x) ... teaching the doctrine (*dhamma-desana*),¹⁰
- (xi) ... announcing what is true (*bhūtārocana*),¹¹

¹ Pār I M (Pāt 8f.).

² Pār 2 M (Pāt 8f.). Vin V 87,25 (BD VI 126) gives the name *dutiya-pārājika* (“the second offence entailing defeat”). In Sp (III 549,30; IV 864,16) *tisamuṭṭhāna* is used as a key word for this origin against *adinnādāna* (Kkh 37,34; 123,34). For this, see von Hinüber 1992a: 63.

³ Sgh 5 M (Pāt 14f.). In Sp the key word for this origin is *cha-samuṭṭhāna*, see von Hinüber 1992a: 62.

⁴ Sgh 10 (Pāt 16f.). In Sp the key word for this origin is *dhuranikkhepa*, but in addition *samanubhāsana* is used too, see von Hinüber 1992a: 63ff.

⁵ Niss 1 M (Pāt 28f.). This rule is called *kathina-sikkhāpada* in the Kkh tradition (*paṭhama-kathina-sikkhāpada* in the Sp tradition, Sp III 650,30f.), translated as “the rule about the *kathina* frame” in Pāt 29. This translation results from an interpretation of how the *kathina* period of the Saṅgha was opened and terminated, that is, the idea that the *kathina* cloth was spread over a *kathina* frame and withdrawn again at the end. For an overview on the *kathina* ceremony, see Bechert 1968: 319–29; Kieffer-Pülz 2000: 394–96. Since *kathina* may refer to the cloth used for opening and terminating the *kathina* period as well as for the period itself, and for the privileges during this period, it seems better to keep “*kathina*” rather than translate “*kathina* frame”.

⁶ Niss 16 M (Pāt 38f.).

⁷ Pāc 4 M (Pāt 46f.).

⁸ Pāc 27 M (Pāt 54f.). In Sp the key word for this origin is *catu-samuṭṭhāna*, see von Hinüber 1992a: 62.

⁹ Pāc 66 M (Pāt 68f.).

¹⁰ Sekh 57 (Pāt 102f.).

¹¹ Pāc 8 M (Pāt 48f.).

- (xii) ... ordaining¹ a woman thief (*corī-vuṭṭhāpana*),²
- (xiii) ... [one] without permission (*ananuññāta*).³

There, (i) whatever [offence] originates in body and thought (*origin 10.4*), this is called “[an offence] having the origin of the first [rule entailing] defeat” (*pathama-pārājika-samuṭṭhāna*).

(ii) Whatever [offence] originates because of the three origins [dependent on] intention (*sacittaka; origins 10.4–6*), this is called “[an offence] having the origin of [the rule about] taking what is not given” (*adinnā-dāna-samuṭṭhāna*).

(iii) Whatever [offence] originates because of all six [origins] (*origins 10.1–6*), this is called “[an offence] having the origin of [the rule about] a go-between” (*sañcaritta-samuṭṭhāna*).

(iv) Whatever [offence] originates because of the sixth [origin] only (*origin 10.6*), this is called “[an offence] having the origin of [the rule about] admonition” (*samanubhāsana-samuṭṭhāna*).

(v) Whatever [offence] originates because of the third and sixth [origins] (*origins 10.3; 10.6*), this is called “[an offence] having the origin of the *kaṭhina* [rule]” (*kaṭhina-samuṭṭhāna*).⁴

(vi) Whatever [offence] originates because of the first and fourth [origins] (*origins 10.1; 10.4*), this is called “[an offence] having the origin of the [rule about] sheep’s wool” (*eḷakaloma-samuṭṭhāna*).

¹ For a discussion of a different way of translating *vuṭṭhāpeti*, see Juo-hsüeh (2000: 373–404); and, more comprehensive, Norman (2001: 121–37; reprint in: Norman 2007: 199–215). Norman and Pruitt in their translation of the Pātimokha (Pāt) translated *vuṭṭhāpeti* by “to sponsor [for ordination]”. Since in connection with the ordination in the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha the verb *vuṭṭhāpeti* is used, and the casuistry makes it clear that the legal procedure spoken about is a *ñatti-catuttha-kamma** (for instance, Vin IV 317,25–30) — not a *ñatti-dutiya-kamma** as necessary for the *vuṭṭhā(pa)na-sammuti* “allowance for ordination” which precedes the ordination — it is clear that the activity referred to by *vuṭṭhāpeti* is the ordination of a candidate within the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha. Therefore, we translate *vuṭṭhāpeti* here as “ordain”.

² Sgh 2 N (Pāt 124f.).

³ Pāc 80 N (Pāt 188f.).

⁴ The translation in BD VI 128 (Vin V 88,20f.) should read “these twenty-nine [offences] may — as regards the three doors — arise from body and speech, not intention” rather than “these twenty-nine may from the three doors arise by body and speech but not by thought”.

(vi) Whatever [offence] originates because of the second and fifth [origins] (*origins* 10.2; 10.5), this is called “[an offence] having the origin of [the rule about] the doctrine word-by-word” (*padaso-dhamma-samuṭṭhāna*).

(vii) Whatever [offence] originates because of the first, third, fourth, and sixth [origins] (*origins* 10.1; 10.3; 10.4; 10.6), this is called “[an offence] having the origin of [the rule about] journeying” (*addhāna-samuṭṭhāna*).

(viii) Whatever [offence] originates because of the fourth, and sixth [origins] (*origins* 10.4; 10.6), this is called “[an offence] having the origin of [the rule about] a caravan of thieves” (*theyya-sattha-samuṭṭhāna*).

(ix) Whatever [offence] originates only because of the fifth [origin] (*origin* 10.5), this is called “[an offence] having the origin of [the rule about] teaching the doctrine” (*dhamma-desana-samuṭṭhāna*).

(x) Whatever [offence] originates because of the three origins not [dependent on] intention (*acittaka*) (*origins* 10.1–3), this is called “[an offence] having the origin of [the rule about] announcing what is true” (*bhūtārocana-samuṭṭhāna*).

(xi) Whatever [offence] originates because of the fifth and sixth [origins] (*origins* 10.5; 10.6), this is called “[an offence] having the origin of [the rule about] ordaining a woman thief” (*corī-vutṭhāpana-samuṭṭhāna*).

(xii) Whatever [offence] originates because of the second, third, fifth, and sixth [origins] (*origins* 10.2; 10.3; 10.5; 10.6), this is called “[an offence] having the origin of [the rule about one] without permission” (*ananuññāta-samuṭṭhāna*).

Thus the regulation is to be understood throughout by virtue of this rule of the origins too.

(11–13) “[Having recognized] the variety according to activity, awareness, and intention” (Kkh 35.10) means: Knowing the variety of all the offences in accordance with “activity”, etc., the regulation is to be understood throughout.

(11) For all offences are fivefold by virtue of “activity” (*kiriyā*) in the following manner:

- (11.1) there is an offence, which originates in activity (*kiriyā*),
- (11.2) [there] is [an offence, which originates] in non-activity (*akiriyā*),

82

Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat

⟨38⟩

- (11.3) [there] is [an offence which originates] in activity and non-activity (*kiriyākiriyyato*),
- (11.4) [there] is [an offence which originates] either in activity or non-activity (*siyā kiriyyato siyā akiriyyato*),
- (11.5) [there] is [an offence which originates] either in activity or in activity and non-activity (*siyā kiriyyato siyā kiriyākiriyyato*).

There, (11.1) whatever [offence there is of someone] performing a transgression by body or speech as in [the case of] digging the earth,¹ etc., this “originates in activity” (Kkh 37,19–20).

(11.2) Whatever [offence there is for one] not doing what should be done by body or speech such as the offence [against] the first *kathina* [rule],² this “originates in non-activity” (Kkh 37,20).

(11.3) Whatever [offence there is for someone] doing and not doing [something] such as the offence of accepting a robe from the hand of a bhikkhūnī not related [to him],³ this [24] “originates in activity and non-activity” (Kkh 37,20).

(11.4) Whatever [offence there is for someone] whether he is doing [something] or not doing [something] such as the offence of accepting money,⁴ this “originates either in activity or in non-activity” (Kkh 37,20–21).

(11.5) Whatever [offence there is for someone] whether he is doing [something] or doing and not doing [something] such as the offence about making a hut,⁵ this ⟨38⟩ “originates either in activity or in activity and non-activity” (Kkh 37,21).

(12) And all offences are twofold by virtue of “awareness” (*saññā*):

- (12.1) [those] “having acquittal due to [lacking] awareness” (*saññā-vimokkha*), and

¹ Pāc 10 M (Pāt 48f.); the offence covers a bhikkhu who digs the earth or who has it dug (that is, tells someone else to dig it). Digging the earth, however, also belongs to the “actions preceding [the main action]” (*pubba-payoga*) in case of the theft of an object in the earth.

² Niss 1 M (Pāt 28f.). Here the key word *pāthama-kathina*^o is used for Niss 1 M, which normally is employed in the Sp tradition, not in the Kkh tradition, which calls this rule merely *kathina-sikkhāpada*.

³ Niss 5 M (Pāt 30f.).

⁴ Niss 18 M (Pāt 38f.).

⁵ Sgh 6 M (Pāt 14f.).

⟨38⟩*Pārājika I M*

83

(12.2) [those] having “no acquittal due to awareness” (*no-saññā-vimokkha*).¹

There, (12.1) whichever [offence] one is acquitted of because of the absence of awareness of a transgression, this [offence is classified as having] “acquittal due to [lacking] awareness”;

(12.2) [each] other [offence is classified as] having “no acquittal due to awareness”.²

(13) And further, all [offences] are twofold by virtue of “intention” (*citta*):

(13.1) [offences dependent on] intention (*sacittakā*; i.e. intentional-type [offences]) and

(13.2) [offences] not [dependent on] intention (*acittakā*; unintentional-type [offences]).

There, (13.1) whichever [offence] originates only by virtue of an origin [dependent on] intention, that is an [offence dependent on] intention.

(13.2) Whichever [offence] originates [through an origin] not [dependent on] intention or combined with intention,³ that is [an offence] not [dependent on] intention.

(14, 15) “[Having recognized] the diversity of faults and deeds” (Kkh 35,11) means:

Here, (14) all offences are twofold by virtue of “faults” (*vajja*):

(14.1) “fault according to common opinion” (*loka-vajja*) [and]

(14.2) “fault according to a precept [laid down by the Buddha]” (*paññatti-vajja*).

¹ Kkh 38,2f: *no* should be written as a compound with the following word.

² *nosaññā-vimokkha*; for details, see Appendix 16.

³ Kkh 38,7 for *sacittamissakena* read *sacittakamissakena*. The definition in Sp I 270,30–71,1 is: *yam sah' eva cittena āpajjati, tam sacittakam, yam vināpi cittena āpajjati, tam acittakam*. “Whichever [rule of training (*sikkhāpada*)] one breaks only with intention, that is [a rule dependent on] intention (that is, an intentional type of rule); whichever [rule of training] one breaks also without intention, that is [a rule] not [dependent on] intention (that is, an unintentional type of offence).” In Sp, the remarks are made concerning rules of training (*sikkhāpada*), but in Kkh the same would apply for offences (*āpatti*).

84

Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat

⟨38⟩

There, (14.1) with respect to whichever [offence] in the case of intention,¹ the thought is unwholesome, this [offence] is [classified as] a “fault according to common opinion”.

(14.2) The remaining [offences] are [classified as] “fault[s] according to a precept [laid down by the Buddha]”.

And all [offences] are threefold:

- (15.1) by virtue of physical deed (*kāya-kamma*),
- (15.2) verbal deed (*vaci-kamma*) [and]
- (15.3) both of these.

There, (15.1) [an offence] which is committed by the door of the body is called a physical deed.

(15.2) [An offence] which is committed by the door of speech is called a verbal deed.

(15.3) [An offence] which is committed by both [doors] is called a physical deed and a verbal deed. In the door of the thought there is no offence.

Thus, also in respect of the diversity of faults and deeds, the regulation is to be understood throughout.

(16–17) “[Having recognized] the rule of the pair of triads” (Kkh 35,11) means:

(16) the rule of the triad [beginning with] a wholesome [type of] thought and

(17) of the triad of [types of] feeling.

(16) For when committing an offence, one commits it with an unwholesome [type of] thought or with a wholesome or a neutral [type of] thought.

(17) Likewise, [the offender] is endowed with an unpleasant feeling, or he is endowed with the pair of the other feelings (i.e. pleasant or indifferent feelings).

(16) Though it is like that, in all rules of training [the classification is given as] “one [type of] thought” (*ekam cittam*) by virtue of the unwholesome [type of] thought,² “two [types of] thought” (*dve cittāni*)

¹ That is, in case intention is present. This has been misunderstood by Juo-hsüeh 2000: 62, n. 72 (see Appendix 13). What is meant here is that if intention is present, and the thought is unwholesome, the offence is classified as *loka-vajja*, “a fault according to common opinion”.

² In the classifications this is given as *akusala-cittam* throughout.

⟨39⟩

Pārājika I M

85

by virtue of the wholesome and the neutral [types of] thought,¹ [and]
“three [types of] thought” (*tīni cittāni*)² by virtue of all of them;

(17) [as] “one [type of] feeling” (*ekā vedanā*) by virtue of the unpleasant feeling,³ “two [types of feeling]” (*dve*) by virtue of the pleasant and indifferent [type of feeling],⁴ “three [types of feeling]” (*tisso vedanā*) by virtue of all of them.⁵

Only this division is permitted, not another.

Having recognized this characteristic consisting of seventeen parts, which is common to [all rules]⁶ (Kkh 35,12) means: knowing this characteristic having seventeen forms beginning with the “provenance” (= 1. provenance) [of the rule] and ending with the “triad of feelings” (= 17. feeling).

“A wise man will connect it [with the rules] here and there as it conforms [to them]” (Kkh 35,13) means: a skilled bhikkhu will connect this characteristic with this or that rule of training as it corresponds [to the respective rule. If] that [characteristic], however, is not connected [with the respective rule], it is hard to understand [it]. Therefore, we shall point it out, connecting it —without quoting this list, in fact (*mātika*; see above, Kkh 35,8–11) — to the end of the specific regulation⁶ of each of the rules of training.⁷ ⟨39⟩

Here, however, [follows] the junction of the [characteristic] to it (Pār I M).⁸ This [rule] was prescribed at Vesāli (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Elder Sudinna (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “transgression consisting in sexual intercourse” (= 3. *subject matter*).

¹ Listed in the classification as *kusalābyākata-cittehi dvi-cittam*, Kkh 149,22f. = Sp IV 753,2 [Pāc 8 M].

² In the classifications this is given as *ti-cittam*.

³ In the classification this is given as one feeling (*eka-vedanā*).

⁴ In the classification this is given as two feelings (*dvi-vedanā*).

⁵ In the classification this is given as three feelings (*ti-vedanā*).

⁶ Lit. the regulation not common for other rules, that is, specific for the respective rule to which it is attached.

⁷ This refers to the final lines attached to each Pātimokha rule, which consist of the classification of the respective rule; see, for example, Kkh 48,9f. for the classification of Pār 2 M.

⁸ The number and translation of the names of the seventeen classification categories are given in round brackets.

This [phrase,] “should engage in sexual intercourse” (*methunam dhammanī pātiseveyya*, Pāt 8,5–6), [is] the prescription here (= 4. *prescription*). “Without having renounced the training” (*sikkham apacakkhāya*, Pāt 8,5), and “even [if it is] with a female animal” (*antamaso tiracchānagatāya pi*, Pāt 8,6) are the two supplementary prescriptions [of Pār 1 M]. And “supplementary prescription” means it makes [an action] an offence, as in the rule of training “speaking evasively (lit. of something else)¹ etc.; or it does not make [an action] an offence, as in [such cases as] “unless [it is] in a dream”,² etc. Or it makes for the strengthening of an offence, as in [the rule of training] “taking what is not given”,³ etc. [25] Here (i.e. in Pār 1 M), however, [the supplementary prescription] is to be known as making for the strengthening [of the rule].⁴ But hereafter, where there is a supplementary prescription, we shall point out this much only: “This is a supplementary prescription.”⁵ The [following] regulation is to be understood throughout, [i.e.] that except for the “supplementary prescription” (*anupaññatti*), the remaining [rules are] only “prescription[s]” (*pāññatti*). [A rule is classified as] “a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs]” (*sādharaṇa-pāññatti*)⁶ through its being prescribed for bhikkhunīs too

¹ Pāc 12 M (Pāt 48f.). Here the “supplementary prescription” (Vin IV 36,37) strengthens the “prescription” (Vin IV 36,18) insofar as not only does someone who speaks evasively commit an offence, but according to the “supplementary prescription”, someone who speaks evasively and causes trouble does so as well.

² Sgh 1 M (Pāt 12f.). The “supplementary prescription” of Sgh 1 M (Vin III 112,17f.) is a relaxation of the “prescription” (Vin III 112,4), since a bhikkhu emitting semen during a dream (content of the “supplementary prescription”) is exempted from an offence against Sgh 1 M.

³ Pār 2 M (Pāt 8f.). “Prescription” (Vin III 45,15–19), and “supplementary prescription” (Vin III 46,16–20). By adding *gāmā vā araññā vā* in the “supplementary prescription” the rule is explicitly extended to every region on hard soil.

⁴ The “supplementary prescription” explicitly extends the rule that forbids sexual intercourse to include sexual intercourse with animals.

⁵ That is, without saying whether it is strengthening or relaxing the “prescription” (*pāññatti*)

⁶ This category is listed in Kkh in addition to the categories given above. It is defined in Sp VII 1302,^{28–31} but not listed together with the other classification categories at the end of each rule in Sp.

⟨39⟩

Pārājika I M

87

— even in a case (*vatthu*) that has arisen for a bhikkhu¹ — in the [following] way:² “Whatever bhikkhunī should willingly³ engage in sexual intercourse”⁴ (= 4. *prescription*).

Because of not committing [an offence] by command [the respective rule is classified as one] not connected with commanding [someone else].⁴ The one who commands a bhikkhu, however, [in case of an *anāñattika* rule] is not released from the offence of making [others] take⁵ what is not lawful (i.e. according to the rules of the Saṅgha)⁶ (= 5. *command*).

d—d Sp VII 1302,32f.

¹ Pāt 116,4f. [Par 1 N], this is Pārājika 1 formulated for bhikkhunīs. The rules for bhikkhunīs that are held in common with bhikkhus are not spelt out in the Vinaya; that is, they can be grasped only from the rules formulated for bhikkhus. For a more detailed explanation, see Sp VII 1302,31–303,3.

² This explanation of rules that apply to both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs refers to those rules that are not spelled out for bhikkhunīs in Vin but should be understood as being carried over from the Bhikkhu-pātimokkha and adapted for women as illustrated here for the first rule.

³ *chandaso* is defined at Kkh 278,22f. [Pār 1 N]: *tattha chandaso ti* (Pāt 116,4) *methunarāgappaṭisamyuttena chandena c' eva ruciyā ca*. “There **willingly** means: with will connected with passion for sexual intercourse and with inclination.”

⁴ *anāñattika* (“not involving a command, not done by ordering someone else”, DOP s.v. *āñattika*) and its positive counterpart *sāñattika* form a separate category in the classification system of Kkh (see Kkh, Index, 401 s.v. *anāñattikam*; 585 s.v. *sāñattikam*). This category is not given in Sp, where, however, the question of whether an offence can only be committed by one’s own hand (*sāhatthika*) or also by commanding someone else to commit it (*āñattika*) is discussed as part of the “origin” (*samutthāna*). So Pār 1 M is classified as an offence which has only one origination, that is, by body and thought (*kāya-citta*, Sp I 271,20ff.). This automatically excludes the possibility of committing the Pārājika 1 offence by commanding someone else.

⁵ The term *akappiya-samādāna*^o seems to be the usual one, since *akappiya-samādāpana-sikkhāpada* is used only once (Sp-t I 30,16f.), where — in the same context — the Dīgha-nikāya commentaries have *akappiya-samādāna-sikkhāpada* (Sv II 600,35f.; Sv-nt I 41). *Samādāna* and *samādāpana*, however, seem to be used in the same sense, because the term *akappiya-samādāna*^o is based on a rule, where the verb is *samādāpeti* (Vin I 250,10f., see p. 87f, n. 6).

⁶ That is, even if it is an *anāñattika* offence, which means that commanding others to commit the respective offence does not make the instigator guilty of it, the instigator commits an offence of wrong-doing. This is based on the rule

In [case of] physical contact with passion for sexual intercourse, it is [an offence of] wrong doing.¹ [If] in an orifice of the type described [above] for a living body,² even when it is entirely destroyed, without skin, etc., being left over, the mere shape of the sexual organ (*nimitta*)³ is visible, it is an [offence entailing] defeat even for a [bhikkhu] who — when the intention [to have] sexual intercourse is present [in him] — causes to enter⁴ there e—a boil or an appendix of skin⁵ — [all of which] have not lost physical sensitivity^{6—e} — grown on [his] sexual organ

e—e ≠ Sp I 257, 31f.

that one who has gone forth should not make others take what is not lawful, and if he does so, he commits an offence of wrong doing (Vin I 250,10f.: *na bhikkhave pabbajitena akappiyē samādapetabbam. yo samādapeyya, āpatti dukkaṭassa; BD IV 346*).

¹ Physical contact (*kāya-samsagga*) is the subject matter of Sgh 2 M; passion for sexual intercourse is the subject matter of Pār 1 M. The situation described here lies outside the scope of Pār 1 M. Therefore it is considered to be a mere offence of wrong-doing. A parallel to this general statement can be seen in Sp I 265,20ff.: *kāyasamsaggarāgena vā methunarāgena vā jīvamānakapurisassa vatthikosam appavesento nimittena nimittam chupati, dukkaṭam*. “For one who — with passion for bodily contact or with passion for sexual intercourse, without causing [his male organ] to enter the foreskin — touches the sexual organ of a living man with [his] sexual organ, [it is an offence of] wrong doing”). Cf. for similar regulations in case of contact between a *bhikkhuni* and a *bhikkhu*, Sp IV 902,27–30: *bhikkhunīyā kāyasamsaggarāgo, bhikkhussa methunarāgo vā gehassitapemam vā, bhikkhunīyā thullaccayam, bhikkhussa dukkaṭam. ubhinnam methunarāgo vā gehassitapemam vā, ubhinnam pi dukkaṭam eva*. There is a translation and discussion of these rules by von Hinüber 2000a: 64–67 [2009: 249–252].

² See Kkh 34,21 *vaccamagga-passāvamagga-mukhaImagga*.

³ *nimitta*, literally “sign, characteristic”, is used euphemistically for the male and female sexual organs, especially when it is applied in definitions, or with respect to the sexual organs of inanimate objects, such as a figure, a doll, or a dead body. Cf. Kieffer-Pülz 2001: 68, n. 24 [2014: 355, n. 3].

⁴ *paveseti* in this context is normally constructed with the accusative of the object and the locative for the place into which the object is caused to enter. Therefore, it must be the boils, etc., growing on the bhikkhu’s male organ which are caused to enter the sexual organ, which is only visible as a mere shape.

⁵ *camma-khīla*, for details, see Appendix 17.

⁶ The ability to feel, that is, the physical sensitivity of the object caused to enter, is a relevant criterium for the question of guilt or acquittal.

⟨39⟩

Pārājika I M

89

(*aṅgajāta*).¹ For [a bhikkhu] who causes ^fa dry boil or dead skin or hair [on his sexual organ, all of which] have lost physical sensitivity,^{-f} to enter [there, it is an offence of] wrong doing.² If the orifice [is] entirely destroyed, without even the mere shape of the sexual organ being left over, for one who exerts himself³ there, ^git is a grave offence by virtue of the accumulation of wounds.^{4-g}

Likewise, [if] in the case of human beings [a bhikkhu causes his male organ to enter] the eye, nose, orifice of the ear, the foreskin of men, or a wound made by a weapon, and in case of animals such as elephants, horses, etc., the foreskin or a nostril, it is a grave offence.⁵ [If a bhikkhu causes his male organ to enter] an eye, ear, nose, or a wound of animals, however, or a minute sexual organ that is devoid of enough size to enter [as] of snakes, flies, etc., and [if he causes his male organ to enter] ^hthe remaining [parts of the] body such as the armpits, etc., of all [beings]

^{f-f} ≠ Sp I 257, 32f. ^{g-g} Sp I 264,31 ^{h-h} ≠ Sp I 265,1

¹ Cf. Sp I 257,31f.: *nimitte jātam anatthakāyappasādam cammakhīlam vā pilakām vā paveseti, āpatti pārājikassa.* “[If a bhikkhu] causes to enter a skin tag or a boil, the physical sensitivity of which is not lost, grown on [his own] sexual organ, it is an offence entailing defeat.”

² Cf. Sp I 257,32–58,1: *naṭṭhakāyappasādam matacammaṁ vā sukkhapilakām vā paveseti, āpatti dukkaṭassa.*

³ *upakkamato* should be a genitive singular of the present participle in analogy to the constructions in the previous sentences, not an ablative singular of *upakkama*.

⁴ This case falls under *amaggena amaggam paveseti* (see below, p. 91, n. 11) listed in the casuistry of Pār I M (Vin III 33,23f.), which leads to a grave offence (so Kkh-nt 191,18–23; Sp-t II 85,6–11; Vmv I 140,2f.). See Sp I 269,1–4: *amaggena amaggan ti* (Vin III 33,22f.) *dvīsu sambhinnavañesu ekena vanena pavesetvā dutiyena nīharati. imassa suttassa anulomavasena sabbattha vañasaṅkhepe thullaccayam veditabbam.* “[He causes his male organ to enter] what is not an orifice [and withdraws] by what is not an orifice means: If [there] are two wounds united [with each other and] he causes [his male organ] to enter by one wound, [and] withdraws [it] by the second. By virtue of conformity to this rule a grave offence is to be understood throughout with respect to an accumulation of wounds.” IBH’s translation, “He lets the way enter by the way” (BD I 50) is to be corrected accordingly.

The parallel in Sp to this sentence in Kkh is as follows, Sp I 264,29ff.: *nimitta-saṅthānam pana anavasesetvā sabbasmim nimitte chindityā samantato tacchetvā uppātite vañasaṅkhepasena thullaccayam.*

⁵ Cf. Sp I 265,3ff., 13ff.

90 *Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat*

⟨40⟩

(i.e. humans and animals), [it is an offence of] wrong doing.^{1-h} ⟨40⟩

[If a bhikkhu causes his male organ to enter] a dead body's sexual organ, from the [condition of the dead body] being half devoured to [the condition of its] being not rotten, for [just] so long it is a grave offence. When [the dead body] is rotten, [it is an offence of] wrong doing. Likewise, for [a bhikkhu] causing [his] ⁱsexual organ to enter into the mouth [of a decapitated head] opened wide,²⁻ⁱ without touching [it, there is an offence of] wrong doing.³ With respect to a tongue which hangs out of the lips or with respect to the teeth, [it is] a grave offence.⁴ With respect to a lump of flesh fallen outside the sexual organ, [it is an offence of] wrong doing.⁵ This is the division of offences (*āpatti-bheda*) herein (= 6. [*sorts of*] offence).

^j—There is no offence for one who does not know, for one who does not enjoy (i.e. agree to) [the act], for one who is insane, for one whose thoughts are deranged, for one who is afflicted by pain, or for the first wrong doer (*ādikammika*).^{6-j} But herein whoever — because he fell asleep — does not know of the [sexual] approach by someone else, though it did take place, he is “one who does not know” (*ajānanto*).⁷ ^k—Whoever, though he knows [of the sexual approach], does not enjoy (i.e. agree to) it,^{-k} he is “one who does not enjoy” (*asādiyanto*).⁸ Whoever has arrived at incurable insanity by virtue of bile, he is “one

ⁱ⁻ⁱVin III 37,11f. ^{j-j}≠ Vin III 33,32f. ^{k-k}Sp I 269, 18f.

¹ Cf. Sp I 265,15f.

² *vatṭakate*, vv.ll. *vivattakate*, *vattakate*, *vatakate*. *Vatta* (Skt *vyātta*) means “opened wide” (PED s.v.). Sp-ṭ II 106,23, explains it by *vivāte*.

³ This rule is at Vin III 37,10-13; Kieffer-Püllz 2001: 69f. [2014: 356f.]. Cf. the more detailed parallel in Sp I 278,21-26.

⁴ For a more detailed parallel, see Sp I 278,30-79,3 where the activity of the bhikkhu is described as “exerting himself” (*upakkamati*).

⁵ See the parallel Sp I 264,31f.: *nimittato patītāya māṃsapesiyā upakkamantassa dukkaṭam*. “For one exerting himself with a lump of flesh fallen outside the sexual organ, [it is an offence of] wrong doing.”

⁶ For a discussion of this word, see Juo-hsüeh Shih 2000: 59f., n. 66, who translates it as “the original offender”.

⁷ See the more detailed parallel in Sp I 269,14-18.

⁸ Cf. Sp I 269,18-21.

| who is insane" (*ummattako*).¹ One with a mental disturbance caused by
| demons (*yakkhas*)² is "one whose thoughts are deranged" (*khitta-citto*).³

| And for both (insanity and mental disturbance), indeed, the state of
| not knowing because of their indifferent attitude towards fire, gold,
| excrement, or sandalwood, etc., is the measure.⁴ Whoever does not
| know anything because he is afflicted by excessive pain,⁵ he is one
| "who is afflicted by pain" (*vedanatṭo*).⁶ a—Whoever was the first with
| respect to this or that subject matter [for a rule being prescribed],^a he is
| "the first one who commits the act [leading to the prescription of the
| rule]" (*ādikammiko*)⁷ (= 7. *non-offence*).⁸

| Among the four failures⁹ this non-offence [of the first who commits
| it], however, is a failure of virtuous conduct¹⁰ (= 8. *failure*).

| These are the two constituent factors for this [first rule entailing
| defeat]: (i) the intention [to have] sexual intercourse, (ii) causing [the
| penis to enter] an orifice (*maggā*), [and to withdraw] by an orifice¹¹
| (*maggā*)¹² (= 9. *constituent factors*).

^{a—a}Sp I 270, 12

¹ See the more detailed parallel in Sp I 269,21–29.

² See above, p. 70, n. 2.

³ For a more detailed parallel, see Sp I 269,30–70,5. See also Kieffer-Pülz 2013 :
I 411, n. 24.

⁴ Cf. Sp I 270,5–8.

⁵ Literally, "feeling", without differentiating whether it is pleasant, unpleasant,
or indifferent. Sp I 270,10 in the same context reads *dukkha-vedanāya*.

⁶ Cf. Sp I 270,10f.

⁷ See above, p. 90, n. 6.

⁸ Cf. Sp I 270,11ff.

⁹ See above, p. 77, n. 1.

¹⁰ Though the person who committed this offence is not prosecuted according to
the Vinaya rules, his behaviour nonetheless is a failure with respect to *sīla*.

¹¹ See Sp I 268,25–69,4, where the four possibilities are dealt with: (1) *maggena maggam* (causing the penis to enter and to withdraw by an orifice), (2) *maggena amaggam* (causing the penis to enter an orifice, and to withdraw by what is not an orifice), (3) *amaggena maggām* (causing the penis to enter by what is not an orifice and withdraw by an orifice), and finally (4) *amaggena amaggam* (causing the penis to enter what is not an orifice and to withdraw by what is not an orifice).

¹² Pār I M/N originates by one "origin" (*samuṇṭhāna*), that is, origin 10.4 (see
Kkh 37,2, above, p. 80), namely, "body and thought". "Thought" (*citta*) and

From the point of view of origin, etc.,¹ [the offence against] this rule of training has the origin of the first [rule entailing] defeat (*pathama-pārājika-samutthānam*) (= 10. [sorts of] origin),

[it originates in] activity (= 11. *activity*),²
 [has] acquittal due to [lacking] awareness (= 12. *awareness*),
 [is dependent on] intention (= 13. *intention*),
 [is] a fault according to common opinion (= 14. *fault*),
 [is] a physical deed (= 15. *deed*),
 [is done with an] unwholesome [type of] thought (= 16. *thought*),
 [with] two [types of] feeling (= 17. *feelings*).³

And these origins, etc., are [origins] of an offence, not of a rule of training. But for the ease of usage, [26] the instruction has come down in all the commentaries under the heading of the rule of training.⁴

“body” (*kāya*) thus represent the two constituent factors for the origination of a Pārājika 1 offence. If one of them is missing, there is no offence entailing defeat. Sp (I 271,20ff.) is more detailed: *imam pakiṇṇakam viditvā tesu samutthānādisu idam sikkhāpadam samutthānato ekasamutthānam. aṅgavasena dukasamutthānam, kāyacittato samutthāti.* “Knowing the scattered [material, discussed in the preceding section], this rule of training (Pār 1 M) has among its origins, etc., as origin ‘one origin’. By virtue of the constituent factors it has a double origin, [that is,] it originates in body [and] thought.”

¹ “etc.” refers to the other factors (listed Kkh 35,8–12, and explained Kkh 35,14–38,29; above, pp. 74ff.) relevant for an offence. All of them are listed below for Pār 1 M.

² *kiriyam*; Kkh 40,16 (B^e) reads *kiriyam*, which should be preferred; since the classification refers to *sikkhāpadam* all the categories should be in the neuter. In Kkh the form *kiriyā* (f.; referring then to *āpatti*, see below, p. 110, n. 3) is given twice in classifications (the present case, Kkh 40,16, and 48,9, in the latter case without v.l., though B^e here reads *kiriyam* as well), in all other cases *kiriyam* is given (see Kkh, Index, p. 454, s.v. *kiriyam*). The form *akiriyā* is not found in Kkh; *akiriyam* is used instead. Sp also has *kiriyam/akiriyam* in most cases.

³ Compare the classification in Sp I 271,20–31 which is not as well developed. For this difference between Sp and Kkh, see also von Hinüber 1992a: 65f.

⁴ This refers to the fact that the classification categories actually refer to the offence (*āpatti*), not to the rule, though they are listed with reference to the

⟨41⟩

Pārājika 2 M

93

Therefore, in all other places of this sort, only the intended [meaning] is to be accepted without paying attention to the letter (*vyañjana*).¹

For, the Protector, the Great Sage, the Benefactor of the World uttered the meaning (*attha*), not the letter (*vyañjana*), as a refuge.

Therefore, not having taken delight in the letters (*akkhara*), a thoughtful man should make his mind penetrate the meaning.

The commentary on the first [rule entailing] defeat is finished.

⟨41⟩ [2. The commentary on the second rule entailing defeat]

[2. Pār M: *Whatever bhikkhu should seize from a village² or from a wilderness³ what is not given in a way which is counted as theft,⁴ in such manner of taking what is not given that kings, having arrested a robber, would beat or would bind or would expel him, [saying], “You are a robber, you are a fool, you are stupid, you are a thief”, the bhikkhu, seizing anything of such a nature that is not given, also becomes defeated (pārājika*), [incurs] the loss of communal life (asamvāsa*)*.

(Pāt 8,9–14 = Vin III 46,16–20)]

rule (*sikkhāpada*). Kkh often gives *āpatti* as the reference word in definitions of this classification categories whereas Sp generally has *sikkhāpadam* as the reference word (see for example Kkh 38,8f. contrary to Sp I 228,1ff.).

¹ That is, in all other cases of classification it is the same: the classification categories refer to a rule of training (*sikkhāpada*), but one has to understand them with respect to the offence (*āpatti*).

² *gāma** represents each type of settlement.

³ *arañña** represents all areas where there are no settlements, rivers, oceans, and natural lakes. Therefore our translation as “wilderness” does not give the whole sense of the word. This is also true for BD I 73 “jungle” or VinTexts I 4 “wood”. Where exactly the *arañña* begins is different depending on the rule and the respective definition of *gāma**.

⁴ Pāt 9 “in a way which is called theft”; BD I 73 “by means of theft”; VinTexts I 4 “what men call ‘theft’”. Von Hinüber 1999: 47, translates *theyya-saṅkhātam* (Vin III 47,3ff.: *yo ... adinnam theyyasamkhātam ādiyati*) as “wer einen nicht gegebenen, als Diebgut bezeichneten [Gegenstand] ... an sich nimmt”. This would help with the problematic *theyya-saṅkhātam* in various parallel references, but *theyya* does not seem to be used in the meaning “Diebgut” (“das zu Stehlende”) anywhere. Cf. the explanation of Kkh 42,9–17 = Sp II 302,3–12 ≠ Ps II 329,30–30,2 (below, p. 97).

In the second [rule]¹ (i.e. Pār 2 M), here, *from a village or from a wilderness* (Pāt 8,9) means: each and every [village, one] consisting in a single hut, etc.,² whether enclosed (*parikkhitta*) or not enclosed (*aparikkhitta*), whether [inhabited by] human beings (*samanussa*) or [uninhabited] by human beings³ or even every caravan which has settled for more than four months; [each of these] is to be understood as a “village” (*gāma**).⁴ b—Apart from a “village” and the “vicinity of a village” (*gāmūpacāra*),⁵ the rest is called “wilderness” (*arañña**).^{6—b}

There, in order to avoid confusion, this classification should be known:

- (1) a house (*ghara*),
- (2) the vicinity of a house (*ghariūpacāra*),
- (3) a village (*gāma**),
- (4) the vicinity of a village (*gāmūpacāra*).⁷

b—b Vin III 46,30f.

¹ For a discussion of the creation of this rule, see von Hinüber 1999: 46ff.

² The “etc.” refers to the definition of *gāma** in the Word Analysis on Pār 2 M, where “a village of one hut” up to “a village of four huts” are enumerated (Vin III 46,23f.).

³ Alternative: “[inhabited by] beings who are not human.” Both possibilities are considered in Sp II 298,27ff.: *amanusso nāma yo sabbaso vā manussānam abhāvena yakkhapariggahabhūto yato vā manussā kenaci kāraṇena puna pi ḥāgantukāmā eva apakkantā*. “[A village uninhabited] by human beings/[inhabited by] beings who are not human” (Vin III 46,24) means: whichever [village] has been totally taken possession of by demons by virtue of the total absence of human beings or whichever [village] the human beings leave (or: which the human beings leave for any reason) with the wish to return again for any reason.” Cf. Kkh-pt 35,26–36,7; Sp-t II 123,26–24,5, 125,12ff.; Vjb 124,20ff.; Vmv I 170,2–5, 15ff.

⁴ This whole passage repeats the definition of *gāma** as given in Vin III 46,23–27, only the *gonisādinivittho pi gāmo* is missing here.

⁵ BD I 74 “precincts of the village”. The definition of *gāmūpacāra* is given at Vin III 46,27–30.

⁶ Quotation from Vin III 46,30f.

⁷ The explanation in Sp of what is and what is not a village are much more detailed. The categorization given in Kkh is traced back to the Mahā-Āṭṭhakathā by Sp II 299,25ff. and taken as the standard. The relevant passage of Sp has been dealt with in Kieffer-Püllz 1992: B 13.3.1, and von Hinüber 1996b: 107f.

⟨41⟩*Pārājika 2 M*

95

(1) For ^c—“house” (*ghara*) means [the space] inside the place where the water falls from the eaves of the roof.¹

(2) Moreover, whatever water for washing bowls the women throw when standing at the door, [both] the falling place of that, and the falling place of a winnowing basket or a sweeping brush thrown outside in the usual way by women standing inside the house, and the enclosure made to prevent oxen entering by connecting the two corners in the front of the house, then fixing in the middle a gate with a wooden bolt, all of this indeed means “vicinity of a house”² (*gharūpacāra*).^{-c}

(3) [The space] inside the falling place of a clod thrown in this way — as young men showing off their strength stretching forth their arm throw a clod of earth — by a man of medium strength standing in such a vicinity [as described in (2)] of a house, which, moreover, is the outermost house [of a village], means “village” (*gāma**).

(4) ^d—[The space] inside the falling place of another clod of earth [thrown] from there (i.e. from the village)³ means “vicinity of a village” (*gāmūpacāra*).^{-d} The place where the clod rolls after it has fallen is not to be taken into consideration.

(4.1) ^e—In case of an enclosed village, however, only the enclosure (*parikkhepa*) constitutes the exact determination (*pariccheda*) of a village.^{-e} If [such an enclosed village] has ^f—two thresholds,⁴ [the space]

^{c-e}Sp II 299,27–300,4

^{d-d}Sp II 300,6f.

^{e-e} Sp II 300,20f.

^{f-f}Sp II 299,6f.

¹ For *nibbakosa*, see Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B 7.2.2.

² For the definitions of *Kurundī* and *Mahāpaccarī*, see Sp II 299,21ff. The third method refers to the vicinity around the whole house, see Vjb 125,1f.; Sp-ṭ II 124,26f.; Vmv I 170,17–22.

³ But see Vism 72,10f., where the second clod is also thrown from the vicinity of a house. See Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B 13.3.1 (317 and n. 550).

⁴ *inda-khīla*; the *inda-khīla* (in German “Anschlagpfosten”) actually is a post rammed into the ground, so as to project a little above it, in order for the gate leaves to abut onto it when being closed (CPD s.v. *inda-khīla* with von Hinüber 1980: 18 [English translation: 1994: 137f.]; Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 76 n. 124, 314f. and nn. 528ff.; Schlingloff 2013: ch. 2, n. 101 with review by von Hinüber (2017: 189 plus n. 11). *Inda-khīla* is, however, also explained by *ummāra* (threshold), see below, p. 482, probably because the threshold could also fulfil the function of serving as an abutment for the door. For this meaning and further references, see Coomaraswamy 1930: 215. Since here an inner

96 *Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat*

⟨42⟩

inside the falling of a clod [thrown by] someone standing by the inner threshold (*abbhantarime indakhile*)^f means “vicinity of a village” (*gāmūpacāra*).¹ ⟨42⟩ For also in the Word Analysis [of the Vinaya] the meaning is to be understood only this way.²

(4.2) There, whatever vicinity is shown for a village which is not enclosed, by virtue of that the offence [against the rule] “entering a village at the wrong time” (Pāc 85 M),³ etc.,⁴ is to be determined.⁵ Thus the remainder, apart from the village and the “vicinity of a village”, means “wilderness” in this rule (i.e. Pār 2 M).⁶

And the [phrase] *from the village or from the wilderness* (Pāt 8,9) is only a mere brief indication.⁷ But whatever house, vicinity of a house,

inda-khīla seems to be differentiated from another one which then would be an outer one, we assume that here *inda-khīla* refers to a threshold.

¹ Cf. Sp II 299,6f.

² Vin III 46,26–30 : **gāmūpacāro nāma parikkhittassa gāmassa indakhīle thitassa majjhimassa purisassa ledḍupāto, aparikkhittassa gāmassa gharupacāre thitassa majjhimassa purisassa ledḍupāto.** (See BD I 74).

³ Pāt 78,17–20 = Vin IV 166,11f.

⁴ There exist many rules for which the exact definition of a village, etc., plays an important role; for instance *samvidhāna-sikkhāpadam* (Pāc 27 M/Sgh 3 N), *uyyojana-sikkhāpadam* (Pāc 42 M/123 N), *theyya-sattha-sikkhāpadam* (Pāc 66 M) *sañvidhāna-sikkhāpadam* (Pāc 67 M) *kuladūsaka-sikkhāpadam* (Sgh 13 M/17 N), *sāsaṅka-sikkhāpadam* (Niss 29 M, Pāt 4 M) *asaṅkaccika-sikkhāpadam* (Pāc 96 N). Kkh-nt (196,12f.: *vikāle gāmappavesanādīsu ti* (Kkh 42,3) *ettha ādisaddena asaṅkaccikāgāmappavesanam saṅghanāti*) in explaining *ādi* refers to Pāc 96 N. The reason for this explicit statement in Kkh is that for Sgh 3 N another definition of *gāma** and *gāmūpacāra* is valid.

⁵ The definition of the *gāmūpacāra* of a village that is not enclosed as given in the Vinaya is also valid for the rule Pāc 85 M and others (that is, Pāc 96 N, see above, p. 96, n. 4) mentioned only by *ādi*. See also Sp II 300,31–301,2: *tato gham gharūpacaro gāmo gāmūpacāro ti esa vibhāgo saṅkīyati, asaṅkarato c' ettha vinicchayo veditabbo, vikāle gāmappavesanādīsu.* “On account of that, the classification (1) house, (2) vicinity of a house (3) village [and] (4) vicinity of a village becomes confused. Here, however, the regulation (*vinicchaya*) has to be known without confusion for [the rule] ‘entering a village at the wrong time’ [Pāc 85 M], etc.”

⁶ Cf. Sp II 301,8–11. For other definitions of *arañña**, see Sp II 301,11ff.

⁷ *desanā-mattam*, cf. DOP s.v. *desanā-matta*: “a brief indication (giving (merely) an example)” This means that other — not explicitly mentioned —

village, and vicinity of a village is spoken of in order to show their (i.e. the village's and the wilderness's) exact determination, there arises indeed [an offence entailing] defeat for anyone taking away from there an [object that is] the subject matter of a [rule entailing] defeat.¹

*Not given (adinnam, Pāt 8,9) means: the property of another human being.*²

g—What is counted as theft (theyya-saṅkhātam, Pāt 8,9–10): herein [27] thief (thena) means robber (cora); the mental disposition of a thief is theft (theyya); the [word theft (theyya)] is [another] designation for “thinking of taking away”. Saṅkhā (“counting”) and saṅkhāta (“counted”) are one in meaning. The [words saṅkhā and saṅkhāta are another] designation for “group”, as in [the phrase] “for the group ‘diversification’ has perception as its origin”.³ That “which is counted as theft” (theyya-saṅkhāta): that part [of the thoughts which] is “theft”.⁴ The meaning is: that single group of thoughts counted as thoughts about theft. And this accusative [is used] in the sense of an instrumental; therefore, as to the meaning [theyya-saṅkhātam] is to be regarded as “by means of what is counted as theft” (theyya-saṅkhātena). And whoever takes up by means of what is counted as theft, since he has thoughts of theft, therefore to show only the meaning without taking the letter into consideration, the Word Analysis on it (that is, on theyya-saṅkhātam) is taught thus: “[one who] has thought[s] of theft, [one, who] has thought[s] of taking away.”⁵ [Thus] it is to be understood.—g

Should seize (ādiyeyya, Pāt 8,10) means: should take by virtue of one or other of the twenty-five [types of] taking away. But those [types of] taking away^h are to be thoroughly examined putting together five groups of five. The five groups of five are:

^{g—g}Sp II 302,3–12 ≠ Ps II 329,30–30,2 (up to Kkh 42,14) ^{h—h}Sp II 303,31–304,1

objects, can also be subsumed under the respective term. In the present case *ghara*, *gharūpacāra*, *gāma*, *gāmūpacāra*, etc., are all subsumed under *gāmā**.

¹ Kkh-nṭ 196,20 explains it by *padagghānakam*, “[an object] worth one *pada*

² Cf. Sp II 301,24–28.

³ Sn 874d (GD 874).

⁴ That is, a *kammadhāraya* compound.

⁵ Vin III 46,34 (BD I 74).

98

Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat

⟨43⟩

- (1) the group of five concerning various objects (*nānā-bhāṇḍa-pañcaka*),
- (2) the group of five concerning a single object (*eka-bhāṇḍa-pañcaka*),
- (3) the group of five [beginning] with one's own hand (*sahatthika-pañcaka*),
- (4) the group of five [beginning with] "action preceding [the main action]" (*pubba-payoga-pañcaka*), and
- (5) the group of five [beginning with] "taking away by [simple theft]" (*theyyāvahāra-pañcaka*).^{–h}

There, the first two groups of five (1–2) are obtained by virtue of the words stated in the Word Analysis about this very word (i.e. about *ādiyeyya*), [that is to say,]

- ^{h’}–(i) “should seize (*ādiyeyya*),
 (ii) “should take (*hareyya*),
 (iii) “should take away (*avahareyya*),
 (iv) “should cause [someone] to deviate from the path he is moving along (*iriyāpatham vikopeyya*),
 (v) “should move from [its] place (*thānā cāveyya*).”^{–h’}

There, (1) “the group of five concerning various objects” (*nānā-bhāṇḍaka-pañcaka*) is to be regarded by virtue of animate (*saviññāñaka*) and inanimate (*aviññāñaka*) [objects],¹

(2) the other [group of five] (i.e. *eka-bhāṇḍa-pañcaka*)² only by virtue of animate [objects]. ⟨43⟩

How [is this]?

(i) ⁱ–“Should seize” (*ādiyeyya*, Kkh 42,23) means: [if a bhikkhu] lays [legal] claim to a monastery (or a park),³ [it is] an offence of wrong doing. [If] he creates doubt for the owner, [it is] a grave offence. [If] the owner, thinking, “[This] will not be mine”, gives up [his legal] claim, [it

^{h’–h’} Vin III 46,35f. (BD I 74). ^{i–i} Sp II 302,22–303,6

¹ Cf. Sp II 302,20f.

² Since the first two were mentioned before, *itaram* must refer to the other of the two. This tallies with Sp II 302,20, Vin-vn-ṭ I 52,18–21.

³ *ārāma**; in the present context *ārāma* could stand for either of the two meanings given above.

⟨43⟩

Pārājika 2 M

99

[is] an offence entailing defeat.

(ii) “Should take” (*hareyya*, Kkh 42,23) means: [if,] while taking the goods of another, he touches the load on his head with the thought of stealing [it, it is an offence of] wrong doing. [If] he shakes [it, it is] a grave offence. [If] he puts it down on his shoulder,¹ [it is an offence entailing] defeat.

(iii) “Should take away” (*avahareyya*, Kkh 42,23) means: [if,] being spoken to with the words, “Goods have been deposited [by me]; give me [back] the goods”, [a bhikkhu] says, “I will not fetch them”, [it is an offence of] wrong doing. [If] he creates doubt for the owner, [it is] a grave offence. [If] the owner, thinking, “This will not be mine”, gives up [his legal] claim, [it is an offence entailing] defeat.

(iv) “Should cause [someone] to deviate from the path he is moving along” (*iriyāpatham vikopeyya*, Kkh 42,23) means: [If, thinking] “I will lead the one taking the goods with him”, he causes [the person with the goods] to pass [the original path by]² the first step, [it is] a grave offence; [if] he causes [the person with the goods] to pass [the original path by] the second step, [it is an offence entailing] defeat.³

(v) “Should move from [its] place” (*thānā cāveyya*, Kkh 42,23) means: [if] with the thought of stealing he touches property standing on [firm] ground, [it is an offence of] wrong doing. [If] he shakes [it, it is] a grave offence. [If] he moves it from its place, [it is an offence entailing] defeat.⁴

Thus first of all “the group of five concerning various objects” (*nānā-bhāṇḍa-pañcaka*) is to be understood.

(2) j—“The group of five concerning a single object” (*eka-bhāṇḍa-pañcaka*) is to be understood by virtue of

j-j ≠ Sp II 303,12–15

¹ Since it is a load to be carried on the head, putting it down from the head is moving the goods from their place (*thānā caveti*), which is the relevant point for a Pārājika.

² Regularly in other instances of Pār 2 M, the first and second step refer to the passing of the boundary of that space within which the respective object can be touched, carried around, etc., without an offence being committed in this way (Sp II 303,6–10; 359,6f.). Here, however, transgressing by one and two steps refers to the transgression of the original path.

³ Cf. Sp II 303,1ff.

100 *Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat*

⟨43⟩

- (i) seizing (*ādiyana*),
- (ii) taking (*harāṇa*),
- (iii) taking away (*avaharāṇa*),
- (iv) causing [someone] to deviate from the path he is moving along (*iriya-patha-vikopana*),
- (v) moving from [its] place (*thāna-cāvana*) by the means as described [above]¹ beginning with the laying legal claim² to a slave or animal which has an owner.³-^j

(3) k-What about “the group of five ‘[beginning] with one’s own hand’”? (*sāhatthika-pañcaka*)

- (i) with one’s own hand (*sāhatthika*),
- (ii) [done by] commanding [someone else] (*āṇattika*),
- (iii) throwing out (*nissaggiya*),
- (iv) accomplishing a legal case (*attha-sādhaka*),⁴
- (v) giving up the legal claim (*dhura-nikkhepa*).⁵

There, (i) “with one’s own hand” (*sāhatthika*) means: with his own hand he takes away the goods of another.

(ii) “[Done by] commanding [someone else]” (*āṇattika*) means: he commands another, “Take away the goods of so-and-so.”⁶

(iii) “Throwing out” (*nissaggiya*) means:-k throwing outside while standing inside the customs frontier or a [pre-]determined place.⁷

(iv) a-“Accomplishing a legal case” (*attha-sādhaka*) means: he commands another: “When you are able, then take away the goods of

k-kSp II 304,¹⁰⁻¹⁴ a-aSp II 304,¹⁶⁻¹⁹

¹ This refers to the definition of the words *ādiyeyya*, *hareyya*, etc., with respect to “the group of five concerning various objects” just given before (Kkh 43,¹⁻¹⁶).

² *abhiyoga* takes up the verb *abhiyuñjati* (Kkh 43,¹).

³ This shows that the object of this group of theft is an animated being only, as declared in the beginning (Kkh 42,^{25ff.}). Cf. Sp II 303,¹²⁻¹⁵.

⁴ *attha-sādhaka* differs from *āṇattika* insofar as the order to commit the theft is for some time after the command when an opportunity arises, whereas in the case of *āṇattika*, command and theft are simultaneous (Kkh-nt 200,²⁵⁻²⁹; Sp-t II 128,¹⁶⁻²⁰; Vmv I 174,^{1ff.}).

⁵ This fits Pār 2 M, but not the word *dhura-nikkhepa* as used elsewhere, where it also means “burden, responsibility”.

⁶ Cf. Sp II 368,^{21-70,23}.

⁷ Cf. Sp II 304,^{14ff.}; 358,^{24-61,4}.

⟨44⟩*Pārājika 2 M*

101

| so-and-so.” There, ⟨44⟩ if the other person, without obstacle (that is,
| un prevented), takes it away, for the one who gives the command [it is an
| offence entailing] defeat at the very moment the command is given.^{-a}
| Or [28] [if] he places footwear, etc.,¹ inevitably fit to absorb² oil worth a
| *pada* into an oil jar belonging to another, [it is an offence entailing]
| defeat in the mere act of releasing [them] from his hand.³

| (v) b—“Giving up the legal claim” (*dhura-nikkhepa*), however, should
| be understood by virtue of laying legal claim to a monastery (or a park)
| or of goods which have been deposited.^{4-b} Exactly the same method
| also applies to someone not giving compensation⁵ for temporary [goods].⁶

| c—This is the group of five [beginning] “with one’s own hand.”

| (4) What is “the group of five [beginning with] ‘an action preceding
| [the main action]’” (*pubba-payoga-pañcaka*)? It is

- | (i) an action preceding [the main action] (*pubba-payoga*),
- | (ii) an action together with [the main action] (*saha-payoga*),

b—b ≠ Sp II 304,20f. c—c Sp II 304,21–25

¹ *upāhanādīni*; *upāhanā* stands for various types of footwear made from grass and leather (see below, p. 537, n. 2; ^o*ādīni*, according to Kkh-nṭ (201,17) includes “a hempen cloth” (*dukūla-sātaka*), “animal skins” (*camma-kkhaṇḍa*), etc.

² *pivanaka* (lit. fit to drink, can be drunk); so in most parallels (Sp-t II 129,3f.: *telam avassāpi pivanakānam upāhanādīni*; Kkh-nṭ 201,20: *telapivanakam bhaṇḍam*; Vin-vn-t I 53,23: *pādagghanakatelapivanakam upāhanādikīñci-vatthum*). Vin-vn-t has *telapivanārahām* instead in another instance (I 70,23f.: *telapivanārahām dukūlasātakacammakhaṇḍādikam bhaṇḍam*). This clearly shows, that the commentaries understood *pivanaka* in this way. Compare also Sp II 319,21–24.

³ Cf. the exact parallel for the first part at Sp II 304,16–20; parallels for the later part at Sp II 319,3–7 and 319,21–24.

⁴ Sp II 304,20f. only mentions *upanikkhitta-bhaṇḍa*. Sp-t II 129,23ff., Vmv I 174,4ff., Khuddas-nṭ 247,5ff. explain that the same principle applies to the case of laying legal claim on *ārāmas* (*ārāmābhuyuñjana*), etc., and of not giving compensation for temporary goods (*tāvākālikā-bhaṇḍadeyyānam adāne*).

⁵ *bhaṇḍa-deyya*; von Hinüber 1979: 277–79 (1994: 119–22), where it is rendered with “payment of damages”.

⁶ Sp II 350,17 *tāvākālikā-gahane pi tath’ eva* (with the preceding lines 14–17) shows that in this case also compensation has to be paid.

102

Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat

⟨44⟩

- (iii) taking away by an arrangement¹ (*saṃvidhāvahāra*),
- (iv) an act of appointing [the time]² (*saṅketa-kamma*),
- (v) an act consisting in [making] a sign (*nimitta-kamma*).

There, (i) “an action preceding [the main action]” (*pubba-payoga*) is to be understood by virtue of [there being] a command.³

(ii) And “an action together with [the main action]” (*saha-payoga*) is to be understood ^cby virtue of moving [the object] from [its] place^{3-c} and by virtue of taking fields, etc., in shifting the [boundary] pegs, etc.⁴

(iii) “Taking away by an arrangement” (*saṃvidhāvahāra*) means: taking away after having arranged, after having consented: “We will take away such-and-such goods”. For, when they have gone [away] after having [it] arranged in this way, when these goods have been moved from [their] place by even one of them, it is taking away (i.e. theft) for all of them.⁵

(iv) ^d“An act of appointing [the time]” (*saṅketa-kamma*) means: act of making aware (*sañjānana*).^{6-d} For if, having fixed a time, such as the time of the morning meal, etc., the one spoken to [with the words] “At such-and-such a time take away such-and-such goods”, takes [them] away neither after nor before (but simultaneously with) the appointed [time], for the one who appoints [the time] this is “taking away” at the very moment of appointing [the time].⁷

^{d-d}Sp II 367,23f.

¹ According to von Hinüber (1968: 117, n. 1), in the passage dealt with by him (Vin IV 64,11f.), *saṃvidahati* is used in the sense of “(einseitig) eine Verabredung festlegen” contrary to *saṅketa-* “gegenseitige Verabredung”. As the present case shows, this was not valid at the time of the commentaries, since here *saṃvidha-kamma* describes a theft with a prior mutual arrangement, whereas *saṅketa* refers to an appointment of time.

² *asañketa*, CPD s.v. “without appointing [a place]”, see also von Hinüber 1968: 117, with n. 273. *Saṅketa* in the context of theft, however, always refers to appointing a time, as Sp II 367,23–68,14 shows.

³ This is always the main action in the case of theft.

⁴ This second possibility is not mentioned in the parallel in Sp II 304,25.

⁵ Sp II 304,26, refers to the Vinaya for this and the following two types of *avahāra*. A detailed discussion, however, is to be found in Sp II 366,8–67,22.

⁶ In Sp II 367,23f., *kāla-pariccheda-vasena saññāṇa-karaṇan ti attho* (“the meaning is, making be aware by virtue of the exact determination of time”) is added.

⁷ For a detailed discussion, see Sp II 367,23–68,14.

⟨45⟩*Pārājika 2 M*

103

(v) “An act consisting in [making] a sign” (*nimitta-kamma*) means: making a sign such as blinking with the eyes, etc., in order to produce awareness. For if the one spoken to [with the words] “Take it away” takes it away neither after nor before (but simultaneously with) the making of the sign, for the one who makes the sign this is “taking away” at the very moment of making the sign.¹

This is “the group of five [beginning with] ‘action preceding [the main action]’” (*pubba-payoga-pañcaka*).

(5) e—What is the “group of five [beginning with] ‘taking away by theft’” (*theyyāvahāra-pañcaka*)? They are

- (i) taking away by [simple] theft (*theyyāvahāra*),
- (ii) taking away by force (*pasayhāvahāra*),
- (iii) taking away by [pre]determination (*parikappāvahāra*),
- (iv) taking away by concealment (*paṭichannāvahāra*),
- (v) taking away by [moving] a lot marker (*kusāvahāra*).^e

There, (i) whoever — f—having made a hole in a wall, etc. — takes away [goods] without being seen, or — having deceived [others] by means of false weights and false coinage, etc. — grasps [goods], for him — grasping [the goods] in this way — the “taking away” is to be understood as “taking away by [simple] theft” (*theyyāvahāra*).²

(ii) But anyone who overpowers [others],³ then by applying force grasps the property of others, **⟨45⟩** like a village robber, etc., or who grasps more than the tax [which is] suitable for him — exactly in the manner described,⁴ as king’s servants, etc., do — for him, grasping in this way, the “taking away” is to be understood as “taking away by force” (*pasayhāvahāra*).⁵

(iii) Grasping after [pre]determining, however, is called “taking away by [pre]determination” (*parikappāvahāra*).^f That is twofold by virtue of goods and place.

^{e—e} Sp II 304,27ff. ^{f—f} ≠ Sp II 375,20–76,14

¹ For a detailed discussion, see Sp II 368,15–20.

² Cf. Sp II 375,19–22.

³ Sp II 375,22 adds *pare*.

⁴ That is, by force; see Sp II 375,26: *balakkārena*.

⁵ Cf. Sp II 375,22–28.

There, this is “[pre]determination of goods” (*bhanda-parikappa*): Someone who needs a piece of cloth, enters an inner room thinking, “If there is a piece of cloth, I will grasp it. If [there is] thread, I will not grasp [it].” In the darkness he grasps a sack. If there is a piece of cloth [in it, there is an offence entailing] defeat in the very act of picking it up (i.e. the sack with the cloth in it). If there is thread [in it, this] preserves [him from an offence]. If he takes it outside, opens it, knows, “It is thread”, carries it back again, [and] puts it [back, this] indeed preserves [him from an offence]. But if he knows, “It is thread”, thinks “Whatever is received is to be grasped”, [and] goes away, he is to be treated according to the number of steps [he takes].¹ If having put it on the ground he grasps it [again, there is an offence entailing] defeat in picking it up. If [he is] followed [by people] crying “Robber, robber”, [and] having thrown it down he runs away, [that] preserves [him from an offence]. If the owners see it and grasp it, [that] indeed preserves [him from an offence]. If someone else grasps it, compensation² [has to be paid]. If the owners turn back [i.e. stop following him], then he, who, after having seen [the object] himself, grasps [it thinking,] “How much more is the object grasped by me with the perception³ [that it is a rag robe from a] dust heap⁴ my property now;”⁵ even he [has to pay]

¹ *pada-vārena* is used in Sp in instances where bhikkhus with the intention of stealing deliberately leave the space protected by a respective command, for instance, if a bhikkhu deviates from the allowed route and goes into the wilderness, which is not allowed (for example, Sp II 323,22f.; 351,5, 28; 352,4, 13f., etc.). From the point of content, the expression *pāduddhāra* (“taking the feet off the ground”; Kkh 157,21; Sp II 334,22, 28; 376,19f.; 774,34f.; 775,2) seems to refer to the same matter. Possibly the two divergent expressions result from different texts, since *pada-vārena* is used in the *Kurundī*, one of the early commentaries belonging to the so-called *Sīhalatthakathā* (Sp II 351,5), and *pāduddhāra* is used in the *Mahāpaccarī*, also one of the old commentaries (Sp II 376,19f.). See also the discussion of this expression of the *Mahāpaccarī* in Vjb 141,21ff. Cf. Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I [Z 50], n. 10.

² *bhanda-deyya*; see above, p. 101, n. 5.

³ *saññā* in such constructions mostly implies that the impression is wrong.

⁴ *pañsu-kūla* is allowed for bhikkhus, Vin I 280,35–37; 282,3ff.

⁵ What is meant is that the owners gave up the search, from which it follows that the object does not have an owner any longer. The bhikkhu now finds the object on the street, which means it is a rag robe, that is to him, so he allowed

⟨46⟩*Pārājika 2 M*

105

|compensation indeed.^f g—There, whatever [pre]determination occurs in
|the manner such as “If there is a piece of cloth, I shall grasp it”, this is
|called “[pre]determination of property” (*bhaṇḍa-parikappa*).

| “[Pre]determination of place” (*okāsa-parikappa*), however, is to be
|understood thus:^g Someone [29] has entered someone else’s residence,
|etc. h—Having seen some desirable goods, he delimits [a space] by virtue
|of the door of the inner room, the veranda, the entrance door of the
|lower [floor of the] palace, the gateway, the foot of a tree, etc., [and] he
|determines, “If they see me here inside (i.e. within the space delimited
|before), I shall give it back as though having grasped it from a desire to
|see it while [I was] wandering around; if they do not see me, I shall take
|it.” For him, taking it there is “taking away” in the mere act of trans-
|gressing the [pre]determined delimitation.^{1-h} i—Thus whatever [pre]deter-
|mination occurredⁱ in just the manner spoken of, i—that is “[pre]deter-
|mination of place” (*okāsa-parikappa*).

| Thus the taking away of one who grasps, having [pre]determined by
|virtue of both these [pre]determinations is to be understood as “taking
|away by [pre]determination” (*parikappāvahāra*).

| (iv) Taking [something] away in covering it, however, is called “tak-
|ing away by concealment” (*paṭichannāvahāra*). It is to be understood
|thus: Whatever bhikkhuⁱ in gardens, etc., seeing a signet ring, etc.,
|belonging to others who have taken them off and put them down, ⟨46⟩
|[thinking], “I will grasp it later”, j—covers it with dust or leaves, as long
|as he does not pick it up, for so long there is no “taking away” (*ava-
|hāra*). But if the owners, searching for it and not having seen it, go off
|with the mere intention “Tomorrow we shall find out”, then for one
|picking it up, there is “taking away” in the act of picking it up (*uddhāre*).
| One, however, grasping [it] at the very time of concealing [it], with the
|perception that it is his own, [thinking], “This is my property”, or with

|^g—gSp II 376,26ff. h—hSp II 376,31–77,4 i—iSp II 377,17–22 j—jSp II 377,25–78,5

| thinks that taking this object now, when it is a rag robe, it is even more his
| property than it was before (that is, when the owners had not given up their
| claim).

|¹ That is, the range within which the bhikkhu will return the object he has taken
|is mentally defined by him depending on where he is — terrace, lower floor of
|a palace, etc.

106 *Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat*

⟨46⟩

the perception that it is [a rag from] a dust heap, [thinking], “Now they have gone, these are goods thrown away”, [has to pay] compensation. Even if they, having come back on the second or third day, having searched and not having seen [it], go away having given up [their] legal claim, [and] it is grasped [by him, he has to pay] compensation indeed.^j For him, being reprimanded afterwards [by someone] who knows [about it, but] not giving it back, there is “taking away” in the giving up of the legal claim by the owners. Why? ^kBecause it was not seen by them due to his action. But whoever with the thought of stealing, not covering property of such a kind lying in such a place, [but] treading on it with his foot, pushing it into the mud or the sand, for him there is “taking away” in the mere act of pushing it in.^k

(v) ^aNow taking away by having moved the lot marker, however, is called “taking away by [moving the] lot marker” (*kusāvahāra*). This too is to be understood thus: If any bhikkhu has dropped [on his share] a lot marker made of bamboo or made of palm leaf with [his] sign on it when robe material is being shared out, he — being desirous of taking the share of another [which is] lying in the vicinity of his own share, [which is] less valuable or more valuable [than his own] or of equal value — picks up the lot marker which had fallen on his own share because of his desire to drop it on the share of another, this preserves [him from an offence] for so long.¹ When it has fallen² on the share of another, it preserves [him] indeed [from an offence]. But if, when it has fallen there, he picks up the lot marker of the other one from that other one’s share, there is “taking away” in the mere act of picking it up.³

If first of all he picks up the lot marker of another from that other one’s share, in picking [it] up because of his desire to drop it on his own share [this] preserves [him from an offence]; also in dropping it, [this]

^{k–k}Sp II 378,5–8 ^{a–a}Sp II 378,9–22

¹ That means that up to this point of his preparations for theft, he is still without guilt.

² Kkh 46,19f: read *rakkhati tāva*, for *rakkhati. tāva*; Kkh 46,20: read *pātite* for *pātike*.

³ The arrangement of actions is as follows: (1) the thief picks up his own lot marker from his own share; (2) he drops it on the share of the other; (3) he picks up the lot marker of the other from the other one’s share, and becomes guilty in that very moment. Thus the fourth action, dropping the other one’s share on his own share, is not specified.

⟨47⟩

Pārājika 2 M

107

| preserves [him from an offence]. ⟨47⟩ [If] he picks up¹ his own lot marker
| from his own share, however, [this] preserves [him from an offence] only
| in the act of picking it up. For one, who, having picked it up, drops it on
| another's share, there is "taking away" in the mere release from his hand.^{2-a}
| This is "taking away by [moving the] lot marker" (*kusāvahāra*).

| Thus, the meaning has been made clear of what was said [above, i.e.
| (Kkh 42,18-19)] "should seize" (*ādiyeyya*) means: should take away by
| virtue of one or other of the twenty-five [types of] taking [away]."

| In such manner (*yathārūpe*, Pāt 8,10) means: of such a kind.

| Of taking what is not given (*adinnādāne*, Pāt 8,10) means: of taking
| the property belonging to another which is not given.

| Kings (*rājāno*, Pāt 8,10): this is said with reference only to Bimbisāra.

| [30] Other [kings] whether they might or might not act like that are not
| authoritative.

| Or would beat (*haneyyum vā*, Pāt 8,11) means: they would strike
| with hands, etc., or they would cut with a weapon.

| Or would bind (*bandheyyum vā*, Pāt 8,11) means: or they would bind
| with ropes and bonds, etc.

| Or would expel (*pabbājeyyum vā*, Pāt 8,11) means: or they would
| drive [him] off.

| You are a robber, you are a fool, you are stupid, you are a thief
| (*coro 'si, bālo 'si, mūlho 'si, theno 'si*, Pāt 8,11-12): With such words they
| abuse [the guilty person].³ In respect of the taking of what sort of things
| that are not given do kings act thus? In respect of [the taking of] a
| *pāda** or something worth a *pāda*.⁴

¹ *uddharati*? Kkh reads *uddharato* ("for him picking up") Sp in the parallel passage reads *uddharati*. In the preceding sentences that have the same structure, *uddharati* is used throughout (Kkh 46,19, 21, 22).

² This is an example for the same type of theft, but the actions are arranged the other way round: (1) the thief takes another one's lot marker from the other one's share; (2) he drops it on his own share; (3) he lifts his own lot marker from his share (up to that point there is no offence); (4) he drops his own lot marker on the other's share. With the release of his own lot marker from his hand the monk becomes guilty.

³ Cf. Sp II 308,10-309,20.

⁴ This value is given in the *akaraniya* (Vin I 96,32f.) preceding the formulation of *Pārājika 2 M*; the Word Analysis of *Pār 2 M*, however, has *māsaka* instead

The bhikkhu taking anything that is not given of such a nature (tathā-rūpam bhikkhu adinnam ādiyamāno, Pāt 8,12–13) means: a bhikkhu taking away, by one “taking away” (avahāra) or another of the [twenty-five “types of] taking away” described [above],¹ such goods, which are not given, as a pāda of an ancient kahāpana² or worth a pāda, whether they are endowed with life or are lifeless, wherever they are placed, in the earth, etc.,³ he becomes defeated (pārājika*). What need to talk about anything [worth] more than that?*

[This rule] was prescribed at Rājagaha (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Elder Dhanīya (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter of taking [goods] which had not been given, [i.e.] the king’s [pieces of] wood (= 3. *subject matter*).

This, [i.e.] “from a village or from a wilderness” (Pāt 8,9; Kkh 41,7), is the supplementary prescription (*anupāññatti*) here (i.e. in Pār 2 M). [The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).⁴

[An offence of] wrong doing [arises] in respect of an action preceding [the main action] (*pubbapayoga*) beginning with going⁵ in order to

(Vin III 47,3f.), and the introductory story to Pār 2 M explains that at that time in Rājagaha one pāda* equaled five māsaka (Vin III 45,10f.). For a discussion of all this, see von Hinüber 1999: 47ff.

¹ Kkh 42,18–47,3; see pp. 97–107.

² According to Sp II 308,28f. the pāda* is a quarter of a kahāpana, which, following Kkh-nṭ 206,9f., is the old kahāpana. According to the Vinaya definition 1 pāda equals 5 māsaka (Vin III 45,10f.), see above, pp. 107f., n. 4.

³ This refers to the various places listed and described in the Vinaya, where the goods may be placed.

⁴ That is, an offence against this rule can be committed by commanding someone else to steal.

⁵ Sp II 310,3–14,25 describes in detail the various *pubba-payoga* and *saha-payoga* in connection with theft (see also Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 476, n. 1). The activities mentioned are taken from the casuistry given in Vin III 47,27ff. Offences resulting from *pubba-payoga* are offences of wrong doing or entailing expiation depending on the rule which is violated by the respective *pubba-payoga*. “Going” with the intention to commit the theft belongs to the *pubba-payoga*, and is qualified as an offence of wrong doing in Vin III 47,37; 48,22, 29, 36; etc. Sp II 310,8–11 explains that a bhikkhu going to steal goods,

⟨48⟩

Pārājika 2 M

109

take¹ [goods]. In the case of touching, [it is an offence of] wrong doing. In shaking [something which is] the subject matter of [an offence entailing] defeat, [it is] a grave offence. For [someone] taking [something not given, it is an offence of] wrong doing for [something worth] a *māsaka* or less than a *māsaka*. In the case of [something worth] more than a *māsaka* or less than five *māsakas*, [it is] a grave offence. In the case of five *māsakas* or more than five *māsakas*, [it is an offence entailing] defeat.² Throughout, ⟨48⟩ the regulation is to be understood by the time of taking it, and by the region of taking it, and by the increase or decrease [in value] by reason of use, of exchanging [the content] of a vessel, etc.³ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence ^b—for one who thinks it is his own, in the case of taking on trust, in the case of a temporary thing, in the possession of a hungry ghost (*peta*), in the possession of an animal, for one who thinks it is a [rag from a] dust heap and for one who is insane,^{—b} etc. (= 7. non-offence).

[The offence against this rule] is a failure of virtuous conduct (*sīla-vipatti*) (= 8. failure).

These are the five constituent factors (*anīga*) here: (i) ^c—it belongs to others,^{—c} referring to another human being, (ii) ^c—the awareness that it

^{b—b}Vin III 55,21f. ^{c—c}Sp II 370,30–71,1

commits an offence of wrong doing with each change of body and speech, even if he does not reach the place where the goods are placed. Cf. Sp II 311,27ff.

¹ Kkh 47,22 reads *karaṇatthāya* without any variants. Kkh B^e C^e, however, correctly read *haranatthāya*.

² See Vin III 52,15–20, with reference to water.

³ Sp II 305,1–308,23 discusses the five conditions (*pañca thānāni*), namely, *vatthu*, *kāla*, *desa*, *aggha*, *paribhoga*, which are to be considered in estimating the value of a stolen object. The fifth being the “use” (*paribhoga*) diminishing the value of the goods, which are stolen. Kkh lists only the terms *kālā*, *desa*, and *parihīna/aparihīna* (see also Kieffer-Püllz 2011: 21). The last being specified by *paribhoga-bhājana-parivattanādi*; *paribhoga* is clear, but the exact meaning of *bhājana* and *parivattana* is not. Perhaps they form a compound, and grasp *bhājanantara-parivattanenāpi* (“also by exchanging the content of a vessel (?)”, Sp II 308,14), which is listed as one of the means by which the value of an object decreases. Kkh-nt 206,23ff., explains that Kkh here gives the short version and quotes the whole passage from Sp (II 305,1–308,23).

110 *Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat*

⟨48⟩

belongs to others, (iii) it is a valuable requisite,¹ (iv) there is the intention of stealing,^{-c} (v) there is a “taking away” by virtue of the [twenty-five “types of] taking away” described [above]² (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The [offence against this rule has the] origin of [the rule] about taking what is not given (*adinnādāna-samutthāna*, Pār 2 M) (= 10. [sorts of] origin),

- [it originates in] activity (= 11. *activity*),³
- [has] acquittal because of [lacking] awareness (= 12. *awareness*),
- [is dependent on] intention (= 13. *intention*),
- [is] a fault according to common opinion (= 14. *fault*),
- [is] a physical deed, a verbal deed (= 15. *deeds*),
- [is done with an] unwholesome [type of] thought (= 16. *thought*),
- [with] three [types of] feeling (= 17. *feelings*).

The commentary on the second [rule entailing] defeat is finished.

[3. The commentary on the third rule entailing defeat]

[3. Pār M: *Whatever bhikkhu should intentionally deprive a human being⁴ of life, or seek a [life-]taking weapon for him, or should utter praise of death, or should urge him towards death [saying], “Good man, what use to you is this miserable difficult life? Death is better for you than life”, with that mental intention and mental purpose (i.e. of inciting death), in many ways (i.e. other than just described)⁵ should utter praise of death, or should urge him towards death, he too becomes defeated (pārajika*), [incurs] the loss of communal life (asamvāsa*)*.

(Pāt 8,16–22 = Vin III 73,10–16)]

¹ Vin I 305,10–13 differentiates between *lahubhāṇḍa lahuparikkhāra* and *garubhāṇḍa garuparikkhāra*. For details, see Appendix 18.

² See Kkh 42,18–47,3, above pp. 97–107.

³ *kiriyam*; Kkh 48,9 *kiriyā* with v.l. *kiriyam*. The latter is the better reading, since the classification categories refer to the word *sikkhāpada*. See above, p. 92, n. 2.

⁴ *manussaviggaham*; for *manussaviggaha* and the differentiation from *manussa*, see Agostini 2004: 73ff.

⁵ See CPD s.v. *iti-citta-mano-citta-samkappa*.

⟨49⟩*Pārājika 3 M*

III

In the third [rule] *intentionally* (*sañcicca*, Pāt 8,16) means: intentionally (alternative grammatical form), having thought with (explanation as to meaning). Having thought, having decided with the intention to kill, “I will kill this [one]”, with the perception indeed, that [this one is] a living creature.¹

Human being (*manussaviggahañ*, Pāt 8,16) means: a living human body starting from the foetus stage.

^d—*Should deprive of life* (*jīvitā voropeyya*, Pāt 8,16–17) means: should separate from life both at the time of being a foetus by means of heating and crushing, or by giving medicine, and at a later time by some treatment corresponding to this.—^d

^e—To make this meaning clear, moreover,

- (1) living creature (*pāñño*) should be understood,
- (2) killing a living creature (*pāññātipāto*) ⟨49⟩ should be understood,
- (3) the killer of a living creature (*pāññātipāti*) should be understood,
- (4) the action (*payogo*) of the killing of a living creature should be understood.

There, (1) “living creature” (*pāñño*, Kkh 48,26) means: a being (*satto*) in the conventional sense; in the ultimate sense, the faculty of life (*jīvitindriyam*).—^e

(2) f—“Killing a living creature” (*pāññātipāto*, Kkh 48,26) means: that intention by which he sets up the action of cutting off the faculty of life.

(3) “The killer of a living creature” (*pāññātipāti*, Kkh 49,1) means: an individual who is endowed with the intention spoken of (see 2).

(4) “The action of killing a living creature” (*pāññātipātassa payogo*, Kkh 49,1) means the six actions of killing a living creature:

- (4.1) by his own hand (*sāhatthiko*),
- (4.2) by projecting (*nissaggiyo*),
- (4.3) by commanding [someone else] (*āññattiko*),
- (4.4) by stationary means (*thāvaro*),
- (4.5) by [an action] consisting in charms (*vijjāmayo*), [31]

^{d–d}Sp II 438,2ff. ^{e–e}Sp II 439,10–13 ^{f–f}Sp II 439,14–21

¹ For the definition in Sp, see Sp II 436,23–37.6.

112

Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat

⟨49⟩

(4.6) by [an action] consisting in magical power (*iddhimayo*).

There, (4.1) “[action] by his own hand” (*sāhatthiko*, Kkh 49,5) means: the striking of [a person] killing [that person] himself, by [his own] body or something attached to [his] body.^{-f}

(4.2)^g “[Action] by projecting” (*nissaggiyo*, Kkh 49,5) means: someone who wishes to kill someone [who is] standing at a distance projects arrows, spears, or stones from a machine, etc., by his [own] body or something attached to his body.^{-g}

^h—Thereby, each [of these two actions] is twofold because of the division in (4.2.1) aiming and (4.2.2) not aiming.

There, (4.2.1) in respect of aiming (*uddisike*), whosoever he strikes aiming [at killing], by the death of this one indeed is he connected with this act (*kamma-baddha*).¹

(4.2.2) Because of striking without aiming (*an-uddisike*), thus, “Let someone or other die”, he, by the death of someone or other, is connected with this act.

But in both cases, whether [the person struck] dies due to the mere [fact of] being struck or later because of that very disease² [that develops out of that strike], at the very moment of being struck [the striker] is connected with this act.^{-h}

(4.3) “[Action] by command” (*āṇattiyo*,³ Kkh 49,5) means: the

^g—^gSp II 439,22ff. ^h—^hSp II 444,1–7 ≠ Khp-a 29,12–16

¹ *kamma-baddho*, v.l. °*bandho* C^e, S^e. According to von Hinüber (CPD s.v. *kamma-baddha*), *kamma-baddha* is a wrong reading of the Burmese tradition for *kamma-bandha*. In CPD, s.v. *kamma-bandha*, the term is qualified as a Vinaya terminus technicus, and the meaning is given as “complicity”. This meaning is too narrow. As the present case shows, the term is not only applied to cases of contract killing with several actors, but also to acts with only a single actor involved. The literal meaning of *kamma-bandha* (Skt *karma-bandha*) is “connection/connected with the action”, and what is meant is that a specific act — murder in the present case — can be imputed to a specific person or not, depending on various concomitants. Sp in the parallels has *kammanā* (B^e, S^e *kammunā*) *bajjhati*, “he is connected with that act”, throughout.

² Sp, Khp-a, and the subcommentaries all read *rogena*. *Payogena* of B^e is secondary.

³ Kkh has no v.l. here, but above in the enumeration (Kkh 49,5) the reading *āṇattiko* (with v.l. C^e °*ttiyo*) is given.

⟨49⟩

Pārājika 3 M

113

| command of [someone], commanding another [person], “Kill so-and-so.”

| There,

- | (4.3.1) i—the subject matter (*vatthu*) and
- | (4.3.2) the time (*kālo*),
- | (4.3.3) the place (*okāso*),
- | (4.3.4) the weapon (*āvudham*),
- | (4.3.5) the bodily attitude (*iriyā-patho*),¹ [and]
- | (4.3.6) the mode of the activity (*kiryā-viseso*)² —

| these are the six determinants (*niyāmakā*) of “command”.³

| (4.3.1) There, “subject matter”^{i–i} (*vatthu*, Kkh 49,17)⁴ means: the individual. For, if [the person given the command] kills the very individual whom he was commanded to kill [with the words] “Kill [him]”, it is an offence for the one giving the command. But [if] he kills another [person] or kills another [person] thinking he is that one, the one giving the command is freed [from the offence]. With respect to being commanded “Kill this [one]”, however, it is [an offence of] wrong doing for the one giving the command.⁵

| (4.3.2) “Time” (*kālo*, Kkh 49,17) means: the time of the morning meal, etc. For if, being commanded, “Kill [him] in the morning”, he kills him in the morning indeed, it is an offence for the one giving the command. Or, if [the killing] is restricted [to] “Kill [this one] in the

| i–i Sp II 446,12ff.

¹ *iriyā-patha* is not defined in Kkh in this place. The definition in Sp shows that *iriyā-patha* here refers to the four bodily attitudes: walking, standing, sitting, lying down (Sp II 446,18f.: *iriyāpatho ti* (Sp II 446,12) *māretabbassa gamanam vā nisajjā vā ti evam ādi*. “Movement means: the going or sitting down of the [person] who is to be killed, in that way, etc.”).

² *kiryāvisesa*; defined in Sp II 446,19–21: *kiryāviseso ti* (Sp II 446,13) *vijjanam vā chedanam vā bhedanam vā saṅkhamunḍakam vā ti evam ādi*. “**Kiryā-visesa** means: piercing or cutting or splitting or the shell-tonsure (a kind of torture), etc.” See also Khuddas-pṭ 67,27f. for a slightly different list.

³ From (4.3.1) to here this is a śloka stanza. In Sp II 446,12f., this stanza is given as an alternative to another stanza. For a slightly different version, see Vin-vn, v. 255.

⁴ For the explanation of *vatthu* in Sp, see Sp II 446,21–29.

⁵ This refers to the fact that even if the instigator does not succeed, he is guilty of having given this command. See also above, pp. 87f., n. 6.

114 *Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat*

⟨50⟩

morning”¹ ⟨50⟩ [and] he kills [that person] after or before the [morning], the one giving the command is freed [from the offence].

According to this method the regulation is to be understood throughout.²

(4.4) ^j“[Action] by stationary means” (*thāvaro*, Kkh 49,5) means: beginning thus, digging pitfalls, preparing supports,³ depositing swords, etc., ^jthe use of poison in tanks, etc., the offering of sights,⁴ by one desirous of killing by a non-movable means.⁵

And exactly in the way mentioned [above, Kkh 49,10ff.], the division of (a) aiming and (b) not-aiming is to be understood here as well.

(4.5) “[An action] consisting in charms” (*vijjāmaya*, Kkh 49,6) means: the muttering of charms in order to kill.⁶

(4.6) “[An action] consisting in magic power” (*iddhimaya*, Kkh 49,6) means: ^kthe use of magic power which arises from the maturation of [past] acts.^{7-k}

^a“*Or should seek a [life-]taking weapon for him*” (*satthahārakam vāssa pariyeseyya*, Pāt 8,17): herein, the word “taking” (*hāraka*) means: it takes [away] (*harati*). Takes [away] what? Life. Or “taking” (*hāraka*)

^{j-j}Sp II 439,24f. ^{k-k}Sp II 440,11f. ^{a-a}Sp II 441,16-24

¹ Kkh 49, n. 19, v.l. of C^e, S^e. Kkh main text must relate *niyāmitam* to *pure-bhattam*. The sense, however, is not to restrict the morning, but to restrict the killing of a person to the morning time.

² For the explanation of Sp, see Sp II 446,30-47,6. Kkh only defines the first two determinants of the six listed in the stanza. Sp (II 446,16ff.) defines the other four as well. Kkh-nṭ 214,5ff., therefore, adds the respective definitions from Sp.

³ Vin III 76,34-77,1 (BD I 133) gives various types of preparing a support, such as putting a knife in it, smearing it with poison, etc. Sp II 458,25ff. (= Kkh-nṭ 214,19-25) explains that a support is cut or perforated at one end, and some weapon, knives, etc., are fixed (*thapana*) there. The intention was that a person leaning against that support, hurts himself.

⁴ *rūpūpahāra*; according to Vin III 77,10ff. (BD I 133f.) and Sp II 461,19ff. not only frightful, but also lovely sights were thought of as being capable of causing death.

⁵ Cf. Sp II 439,24ff.

⁶ According to Sp II 439,27f. these two types of action (4.5, 4.6) are not handed down in the Vinaya. For explanations, see Sp II 439,28-40,11.

⁷ For explanations, see Sp II 440,11-41,15.

⟨50⟩

Pārājika 3 M

115

means: it is to be taken (*haritabbam*); the meaning is: it is to be put near (*upanikkhipitabbam*). *Satthahārakam* means: “taking that which is a sword” (resolution of the compound).¹

For him (*assa*, Pāt 8,17) means: for the human being.

[He] should seek (*pariyeseyya*, Pāt 8,17) means: he should so act that he gets [what he desires]. The meaning is: he should put near. By that he shows “the action by stationary means”.² For, otherwise in the mere act of seeking there would be [an offence entailing] defeat, and this is not fitting. But in the Word Analysis [of the Vinaya] — without taking the letter of this into consideration — “or sword”, etc.,³ is said to show only that weapon, which here is included in the “action by stationary means”.^{—a}

Or should utter praise of death (*maranavaṇṇam vā samvaṇṇeyya*, Pāt 8,17–18) means: by speech or having written on a palm leaf, etc., would show the virtue in death in such a manner, “Who dies thus gains wealth”, etc. By this he is not thus [freed] here (i.e. in Pār 3 M) as he is freed by a talk on a favourable occasion in [the rule] “Taking what is not given” (Pār 2 M), because of it being said [there with the word], “He should seize” (Pāt 8,10).⁴ Because of the word[s] “should utter praise”,

¹ Gombrich 2014: 43, suggests *sattha* is a perfect passive participle to the verb *śvas*, understanding *sattha-hārakam* as “taking away (*hāraka*) [the breath of] life”, which accords with the first explanation given here.

² Refers to the fourth action of killing, that is, the action by stationary means (*thavara-payoga*), where *upanikkhipana* is mentioned among others.

³ Vin III 73,26ff. (*BD* I 126) adds dagger, arrow, cudgel, stone, knife, poison, and rope. The same weapons are included in what might be deposited in a trap; see Vin III 77,1–5 (*BD* 133).

⁴ What is meant here is that the formulation in Pār 2 M clearly describes an offence entailing defeat only for one “who seizes [goods not given]” (*ādiyeyya*), differing from Pār 3 M, where the praising of death is part of the Pātimokha rule. Therefore, a bhikkhu who describes a favourable occasion (*pariyāya*) of committing a theft, is not guilty, even if someone steals exactly in this way. But if a bhikkhu describes a way of killing oneself, and a person who has heard it acts exactly in this way, the bhikkhu is guilty, since in Pār 3 M this is part of the Pātimokha rule. Vmv I 112,17f. refers to this difference between Pār 2 and 3 M: *pānātipāto hi pariyāyenāpi sijhati, na tathā adinnādānam* (“For the killing of a living being is accomplished also by [speaking of a] favourable occasion, not so the taking of what is not given”).

116 *Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat*

⟨51⟩

however, here he is not freed [from having committed an offence], even by the talk on a favourable occasion. This meaning is to be understood herein.¹

Or should urge him towards death (marañāya vā samādapeyya, Pāt 8,18) means: by such a way as, “Take a weapon”² and so on, [32] b—should cause [him] to adopt a means towards death.^{—b} By this he shows the “action by commanding [someone else]” (*āñattika-payoga*).³ ⟨51⟩

Good man (ambho purisa, Pāt 8,18): this [is a manner of] addressing.

What use to you is this (kim tuyh’ imina, Pāt 8,19), etc., [is] an example of the method of praising.

c—Having such a thought and such a mind (*iti-citta-mano*, Pāt 8,20) means: being of such a thought, being of such a mind.

Having the thought of death expressed in this connection, *Death is better for you than life (matam te jīvitā seyyo, Pāt 8,19)* means: having a mind [full of thoughts] of death. And herein the [word] “mind” (*māno*) is said to illustrate the meaning of the [word] “thought” (*citto*).^{—c} For that very reason, in the Word Analysis on this (i.e. on *iti-cittamano*) one says, d—“Whatever is thought, that is mind”^{4—d}

Having [such] a mental purpose (citta-saṅkappo, Pāt 8,20) means having various⁵ purposes. Here too e—the particle “such” (*iti*) is to be inserted.^{—e} And [the word] “purpose” ^f is the name⁶ of the mere arranging,^{—f} not of the reflection only.^{7 g—} And the arranging in this case

b—bSp II 442,9f.

f—fSp II 442,25

c—cSp II 442,14ff.

g—gSp II 442,25ff.

d—dVin III 74,5

e—eSp II 442,20f.

¹ For the explanation of Sp, see Sp II 441,28–42,9.

² Vin III 73,31 (BD I 127).

³ Cf. Sp II 442,9–14.

⁴ According to CPD s.v. *iti-citta-mano-citta-saṅkappa* the Word Analysis (Vin III 74,5) misinterprets the rule (Vin III 73,14). Cf. the parallel in Sp II 442,14–19.

⁵ *citta*, “thought, intention”, misunderstood as *citra* by the authors of Kkh and Sp II 442,27 according to CPD s.v. *iti-citta-mano-citta-saṅkappa*.

⁶ Kkh reads *nāma* where Sp generally has *adhivacana*.

⁷ This “only” gives the impression that the reflection is part of *saṃvidahana*; the parallel of Sp II 442,23ff., however, does not support this (c’ ettha saṅkappo ti na idam (v.l. *idam na*) vitakkassa nāmam, atha kho saṃvidahanamattass’ etamp; *adhivacanam*, “and herein the [word] *saṅkappo* is not the name of the reflection, but this is the designation of the mere arranging.”)

⟨51⟩

Pārājika 3 M

117

(atthe) is included by awareness (*saññā*), volition (*cetanā*), and intention (*adhippāya*).^{1-g} Therefore, [the compound] “having such a mental purpose” shall be shown as having the following meaning in this case: h-being aware of death^{-h} expressed in this connection [with the words:] “Death is better for you than life”, h-having a thought of death, having the intention of death.^{-h} For, exactly this method has been shown in the Word Analysis too.² By this [the Vinaya] shows that for one uttering the doctrine in such a way i-“living for one day strenuously putting forth energy would be better for him”,⁻ⁱ without any intention of death, etc., there is indeed no praise [of death].³

In many ways (*anekapariyāyena*, Pāt 8,20) means: in different modes, in various manners. The concluding statement again⁴ [begins] with “praise of death” (*maraṇa-vannam*, Pāt 8,20–21).

He becomes defeated (*pārājiko hoti*, Pāt 8,22) means: the one depriving a human being of life, even one come into existence at that very moment, in the manner spoken of [above], becomes defeated.

This [rule] was prescribed at Vesālī (= 1. provenance) concerning many bhikkhus (= 2. individuals) with respect to the subject matter of depriving one another of life⁵ (= 3. subject matter).

This “or praise of death” (Pāt 8,17) is the “supplementary prescription”, here. [The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. prescription).

It is connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. command).

[It is an offence of] wrong doing in the case of digging pitfalls, etc., to cause death. In the case of a pitfall dug without having aimed [at causing death, it is an offence of] wrong doing, even in the case of someone falling in.⁶ In causing suffering for demons (*yakkhas*), hungry

^{h-h}Vin III 74.6. ⁱ⁻ⁱDhp 112

¹ This refers to the explanation of *citta-saṅkappo* by the Word Analysis in the Vinaya. Cf. Sp II 442,20–43,2.

² See Vin III 74.6 (BD I 127).

³ For a more detailed parallel, see Sp II 442,20–23.

⁴ *maraṇavaṇṇam* vā *saṇṇavaṇṇeyya* stands twice in this rule Kkh 8,17ff., 20f. Therefore the commentary here says “again” (*puna*).

⁵ The background story of the bhikkhu Migalañḍika, who killed many other bhikkhus on the pretext of releasing them from a miserable life, is found at Vin III 68–71 (BD I 116–23).

⁶ On the various other offences given here, see Vin III 76,22–34 (BD I 132f.).

118

Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat

⟨52⟩

ghosts (*peta*), animals in human form, and an animal, it is only [an offence of] wrong doing. In causing suffering to a human being ⟨52⟩ [it is] a grave offence. Similarly in the case of the death of demons, etc. But in the case of the death of an animal, [it is an offence entailing] expiation;¹ in the case of the death of a man, [it is an offence entailing] defeat. In this way, the sort of offence is to be understood by virtue of the sort of action throughout (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one killing ^j-unintentionally (*asañcicca*), for one not knowing (*ajānantassa*), for one not having the intention [to cause] death (*na marañādhippāyassa*), and for one who is insane,^j etc.

^k-There, “unintentionally” (*asañcicca*) means: even if another has died by a means used [by someone] not thinking, “By this means I will kill him” as in the case of raising the hammer,² it is no offence.^{-k a-}“Not knowing” (*ajānantassa*) means: even if another has died by a means [used by someone] not knowing, “By this means, this one will die”, as in the case of the poisoned alms food,³ it is no offence.^{-a b-}“Not having the intention [to cause] death” (*na marañādhippāyassa*) means: even if someone has died by a means [used by someone] not wishing death, as in the case of the medicines,⁴ it is no offence.^{-b} This is the way the regulation should be understood with respect to “unintentionally, etc.” (= 7. *non-offence*).

It is a failure of virtuous conduct (= 8. *failure*).

These are the five constituent factors here: (i) a living human being, (ii) being aware that it is a living being,⁵ (iii) the intention⁶ to kill, (iv) the means, (v) death by this [means] (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The [offence against this rule has the] origin of [the rule] about taking what is not given (Pār 2 M) (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*),

[it originates in] activity (= 11. *activity*),

[has] acquittal because of [lacking] awareness (= 12. *awareness*),

^{j-j}Vin III 78,35f. ^{k-k}≠ Sp II 463,9ff. ^{a-a}≠ Sp II 463,12ff. ^{b-b}≠ Sp II 463,15-18

¹ This refers to Pāc 61 M (Pāt 68), 142 N (Pāt 210).

² See Vin III 79,25-33 (BD I 138).

³ See Vin III 80,28-37 (BD I 140).

⁴ See Vin III 82,31-83,23 (BD I 143f.).

⁵ *saññitā*, probably not p.p. as noted in *PED*, but an abstract from *saññī*.

⁶ *vadhaka-citta*; Sp-II 260,5, 22, etc., Vibh-mūlat 210, etc., have *vadhaka-cetanā* instead, indicating that *citta* has been understood in the sense of *cetanā*.

⟨53⟩*Pārājika 4 M*

119

- | [is dependent on] intention (= 13. *intention*),
- | [is] a fault according to common opinion (= 14. *fault*),
- | [is] a physical deed, a verbal deed (= 15. *deeds*),
- | [is done with an] unwholesome [type of] thought (= 16. *thought*),
- | [with an] unpleasant feeling (= 17. *feeling*).

The commentary on the third [rule entailing] defeat is finished.

| [4. The commentary on the fourth rule entailing defeat]

| [4. Pār M: *Whatever bhikkhu should, while not knowing [for certain], boast of a superhuman attainment, knowledge, and insight deserving the [name] “noble”, as referring to himself¹ [saying], “I know thus, I see thus”, then afterwards on another occasion should, whether being examined or not being examined, having committed [the offence and] desiring purification, say thus, “Friend, not knowing, I said thus, ‘I know’; not seeing, I said, ‘I see’; I spoke idly, falsely, vainly” unless [it is] from an overestimation [of himself], he too becomes defeated (pārājika*), [incurs] the loss of communal life (asamvāsa*)*.]

(Pāt 10,2–8 = Vin III 91,19–25)]

| [33] In the fourth [rule]² *while not knowing [for certain]* (*anabhi-jānam*, Pāt 10,2) means: not knowing the existence [of the *uttarimanussa-dhamma*, etc.,] in himself because of its not having arisen in his own continuity [of consciousness] (*santāna*).

| ^c-A superhuman attainment (*uttarimanussa-dhammam*, Pāt 10,2) means: the attainment of superior men, [i.e.] of meditators and noble ones. ⟨53⟩

| As referring to himself (*attīpanāyikam*, Pāt 10,3) means: he refers to it (i.e. the superhuman attainment) in himself^c boasting, “[It] is in me”; or he refers to himself in it (*tathā*)³ boasting, “I live in conformity with

^c-c Sp II 489,1ff.

¹ Pāt 11: “boast [of] a superhuman state, knowledge and insight deserving the name ‘noble’, as being present in himself ...”; BD III 157f. “should boast, with reference to himself, of a state of further-men, sufficient ariyan knowledge and insight, not knowing it fully ...”; DOP s.v. *alam-ariya* “suitable for or worthy of the noble ones; truly noble”.

² For this rule, see von Hinüber 1999: 40.

³ Similarly Sp II 489,3, 10.

120 *Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat*

⟨53⟩

it (*ettha*)";¹ [is one] referring to himself; ^d—such a “as referring to himself”.

Having acted thus (i.e. having referred to himself thus) “he should boast”, [that is] the [syntactical] connection.^{2–d}

^e—*Knowledge and insight deserving the [name] “noble” (alamariya-ñāna-dassanām, Pāt 10,3):* Here “knowledge and insight” (*ñāna-dassana*) means: the great supra-mundane wisdom [is] knowledge in the sense of knowing and [it is] insight in the sense of seeing³ due to the perception of an object (*dhamma*) as seen by the eye. “Noble knowledge and insight” (or “the knowledge and insight of the noble ones”) (*ariya-ñāna-dassana*) means: noble, pure, highest knowledge, and insight. One possessing enough noble knowledge and insight (compound) means: knowledge and insight, capable of destroying the defilements, enough, (i.e.) sufficient, for the superhuman attainment consisting here in *jhāna* (i.e. meditative absorption), etc., or noble knowledge and insight enough for him; that *knowledge and insight deserving the [name] “noble”*.^{4–e}

^f—[Whatever bhikkhu] should boast (*samudācareyya*, Pāt 10,3) means: [Whatever bhikkhu], having referred the superhuman attainment of the stated form to himself, should make it known^f to an intelligent human being by body or by speech or by both.

^g—*I know thus, I see thus, (iti jānāmi iti passāmi, Pāt 10,3–4)* [is] showing the quality of [his] boast;^g for, having referred that (i.e. “the superhuman attainment”) to himself, boasting without a roundabout designation, in that way he boasts (i.e. directly).⁵ Therefore, whoever is

^{d–d}Sp II 489,3f. ^{e–e}≠ Sp II 489,12–19 ^{f–f}≠ Sp II 489,25f. ^{g–g}Sp II 489,29f.

¹ For a comparable expression, see Sp II 489,10ff. (*tattha “ete dhammā mayi santi” ti samudācaranto attani upaneti, “aham etesu sandissāmī” ti samudācaranto attānam tesu upaneti ti veditabbo*) which takes up Vin III 92,4f. (*atthi ca ete dhammā mayi ahañ ca etesu dhammesu sandissāmī ti*).

² The commentary there states that *attūpanāyikam* has to be grammatically connected with *samudācareyya*.

³ In analogy to *jānanāthena* one should expect *dassanāthena* here (the reading of C^e and Sp II 489,14).

⁴ In Kkh 53,12 the editors made the next paragraph start with these two words which, however, conclude the preceding explanation.

⁵ Here a monk directly refers to himself as possessing a specific capacity and does not act indirectly, that is, pointing out another fact, which shows that he means himself (see below, pp. 293f., n. 5).

⟨54⟩

Pārājika 4 M

121

described in the Word Analysis [of the Vinaya with words] of the sort, “I entered the first *jhāna*, … I enter [the first *jhāna*], … I did enter upon [the first *jhāna*]”,¹ etc., each one [of these] is to be understood as being included here.²³ For, when he is saying *I know thus, I see thus*, he does not say only the mere words, rather he makes manifest, “This attainment is in me for this and that reason.” For, by him saying, “I have entered”, etc.,⁴ the existence [of such an attainment] by [such] causes as entering on, etc., is made manifest. Therefore it is said⁵ [above (Kkh 53,16–18)]: “Whoever is described in the Word Analysis [with words] of the sort, ‘I entered the first *jhāna*, … I enter [the first *jhāna*], … I did enter upon [the first *jhāna*]’, etc., each one [of these] is included here.”⁶ ⟨54⟩

Then afterwards on another occasion (tato aparena samayena, Pāt 10,4) means: afterwards at some other time than the time of being announced. Thus ^h—this shows the time of the acknowledgement of the offence. But he commits the offence at the very moment of [the attainment] being announced.

But since he, having committed [this] offence, acknowledges [it] — whether accused or not accused by another — therefore it is said, *whether being examined or not being examined (samanuggāhīyamāno vā samanuggāhīyamāno vā, Pāt 10,4–5).*^{–h}

^{h–h}Sp II 490,1–5

¹ Quoted from Vin III 93,20, 24, 28, 34, 35 (*BD I 162f.*). The translation at *BD I 162* “There is an offence involving defeat for telling the conscious lie that, ‘In three ways may I enter upon the first musing’” should read, “There is an offence entailing defeat for telling a conscious lie in three ways: ‘May I enter upon the first musing’ …”. Similarly, the wording should be changed in the following cases about telling a conscious lie in four ways, five ways, etc. (ending p. 171).

² The Word Analysis (Vin III 93,20–100,5, *BD I 162–71*) gives various cases for a bhikkhu using combinations of lying, misrepresenting his opinion, misrepresenting his approval, misrepresenting his pleasure, misrepresenting his intention, wrongly representing all these, saying he has attained various *jhānas* and higher states of concentration, speaking about himself directly or indirectly.

³ The editors of Kkh 53,20 start a new paragraph here. But as the *hi* shows, this sentence is an explanatory statement belonging to the preceding sentence.

⁴ The *ca* (Kkh 53,22) omitted in C^e is superfluous here.

⁵ *tēna vuttam* here introduces a passage quoted from a preceding paragraph of Kkh. For the function of *tēna vuttam*, see Kieffer-Püllz 2015a: 439ff.

⁶ Cf. Sp II 489,29–90,1.

122

Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat

⟨54⟩

Having committed (āpanno, Pāt 10,5) means: having committed [an offence entailing] defeat at the very moment of [the attainment] being announced.

ⁱ—*Desiring purification (visuddhāpekkho, Pāt 10,5–6) means: Desiring, wishing for himself purity consisting in the state of a householder, etc. For, this one, because he has committed [an offence entailing] defeat, if he remains in the state of a bhikkhu, is therefore unable to attain the meditative absorptions, etc.;^{i–1} ^j—thus, for him, the state of a bhikkhu is certainly not [a state of] purity. But since as a householder or as one or other of lay follower, attendant in a monastery (ārāmika*), or novice, he is able to attain the path to heaven by [making] gifts, etc., or the path to release by meditative absorptions, etc.; therefore, for him the state of a householder, etc., certainly is [a state of] purity.^j Therefore it is said [above, (Kkh 54,7–8)]: “Desiring purity consisting in the state of a householder, etc.”*

^k—*Should say thus (evam vadeyya, Pāt 10,6) means: should speak thus. How? [Should say] “Friend, not knowing thus”,^{–k} (ajānam evam āvuso, Pāt 10,6), etc.*

There, *not knowing (ajānam, Pāt 10,6) means: not knowing (ajānanto; alternative grammatical form).*

Not seeing (apassam, Pāt 10,7) means: not seeing (apassanto; alternative grammatical form).

^a—*I prattled empty falsehood (tuccham musā vilapin, Pāt 10,7) means: [34] I prattled; that is to say,¹ I spoke empty [words], from an absence of meaning in the words. [I prattled, that is to say, I spoke] falsehood from the intention to deceive.^{–a}*

Unless [it is] from an overestimation [of himself] (aññatra adhimānā, Pāt 10,7–8) means: whatever overestimation — agreed on as the perception of having attained [an attainment], when it has not been

^{i–i} ≠ Sp II 492,10–13 ^{j–j} ≠ Sp II 492,16–20

^{k–k} Sp II 492,23f.

^{a–a} Sp II 492,28–93,1

¹ *ti vuttam hoti* regularly ends a phrase that explains the meaning of a previously explained word or phrase (Kieffer-Pülz 2015a: 438). In the present case it marks the explanation for *vilapim*, “I prattled. That is to say, I spoke” (*vilapim abhanin ti vuttam hoti*).

⟨55⟩*Pārājika 4 M*

123

attained — b—arises for one, who, after having set up the three characteristics,¹ meditating upon the [conditioned] formations (*saṅkhāra*), has begun [to win] insight,^{—b} setting aside that overestimation, whoever should boast entirely from an evil desire, that one too is one who becomes defeated. This is the meaning.

This [rule] was prescribed at Vesāli (= 1. *provenance*) concerning bhikkhus on the bank of the Vaggumudā river (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter of announcing superhuman attainments (= 3. *subject matter*).²

This “unless [it is] from an overestimation [of himself]” (Pāt 10,7–8) is the “supplementary prescription” here. [The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*). ⟨55⟩

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

³For one announcing to anyone attainments not present [in him] such as the *jhānas*, etc., having the appearance described in the way “I attained the first *jhāna*”,⁴ etc., [it is an offence entailing] defeat, if he announces [this] to anyone who is a human being [and] if straightway that [person] understands by any means whatsoever the meaning, [i.e.] “He is one who has obtained a *jhāna*” or “He is a noble one”; if [that person] does not understand [what is said in this way, it is] a grave offence. But if [that person] understands, when he announces [the pretended attainments] by pointing [them] out in a roundabout manner (i.e. by boasting indirectly), in such ways as “The bhikkhu who lives in your dwelling place has attained the first *jhāna*”,⁵ [it is] a grave offence; if [that person] does not understand [what is said in this way, it is an offence of] wrong doing (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

b—bSp II 488,13f.

¹ The three characteristics of all conditioned states: impermanence (*anicca*), misery (*dukkha*), and no self (*anattā*).

² See Vin III 87–91 (BD I 151–58).

³ The editors of Kh 55,1 start a new paragraph here. But the next section simply is a new subsection within the classification. Thus, it is to be linked to Kh 54,26.

⁴ Vin III 93,20, 24, 28, 34, 35 (BD I 162f.), see above, p. 121, n. 1.

⁵ The bhikkhu referred to is of course he himself, but the announcement is made indirectly (see below, pp. 293f., n. 5). Therefore the offence is only a grave offence.

124

Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat

⟨55⟩

There is no offence for one announcing [such an attainment] because of an overestimation, for one who does not intend to put forward the claim [of such an attainment], and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

It is a failure of virtuous conduct (= 8. *failure*).

These are the five constituent factors (*āṅga*) here: (i) the non-existence of the superhuman attainment in oneself, (ii) the announcement of it from evil desire, (iii) not pointing [it] out in a roundabout manner, (iv) the human nature of the person to whom he announces it, (v) understanding at that very moment [of being announced] (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. *sorts of origin*), etc.,¹ are exactly the same as stated in [the rule about] taking what is not given (Pār 2 M).²

The commentary on the fourth [rule entailing] defeat is finished.

[The commentary on the Pārājika conclusion]

[Recited, venerable sirs, are the four rules entailing defeat. If a bhikkhu has committed [an offence against] one or other of these [rules], he no [longer] obtains communal life together with [other] bhikkhus; as [he was] before [ordination] so [he is] after; he becomes defeated, [incurs] the loss of communal life.]

There I ask the venerable ones, “Are you pure in this?” A second time I ask, “Are you pure in this?” A third time I ask, “Are you pure in this?” The venerable ones are pure in this, therefore they are silent. Thus I record it.

(Pāt 10,9–16 = Vin III 109,21–27])

^c—This [phrase], *Recited, venerable sirs, are the four rules entailing defeat (uddiṭṭhā kho āyasmanto cattāro pārājikā dhammā*, Pāt 10,9) only indicates the [rules entailing] defeat recited here.³ But putting them

^c—cSp II 515,4–7

¹ The “etc.” stands for the classification categories 11 *activity* to 17 *feeling*, see above, pp. 81ff.

² See Pār 2 M for the rest of the classification (Kkh 48,9f., above, p. 110).

³ This passage (Kkh 55,23–56,14) corresponds to the slightly more elaborated text in Sp II 515,4–16,14 (partly indicated in the edition of Kkh). Part of the passage of Sp (II 515,5–16,5) is translated into German by von Hinüber 2000a: 67f. [2009: 252].

⟨56⟩

Pārājika Conclusion

125

together, all in all, twenty-four *pārājikas* are to be known. Which twenty-four? Eight have come down in the text (that is, in the Vinaya): first of all, four for the bhikkhus [and] four that are exclusive to bhikkhunīs.^c These together with the eleven *pārājikas* counted “as the state of being unqualified [for the entrance into the Buddhist community]” of the eleven [persons] beginning with eunuchs,¹ are nineteen. ^d—Together with a bhikkhunī, who becomes defeated (*pārājika**) because of forsaking [the community]^{2–d} as one who longs for the status of a householder, ^d—are twenty.^d ^e—All others they call the four analogue *pārājikas* (*anuloma-pārājika*) by virtue of the [following] four,³ [i.e.] one with a [long] hanging penis,⁴ one with a supple back,⁵ one who takes another’s penis in his mouth,⁶ one who sits on another’s penis.^{1–e}

¹ d–d ≠ Sp II 515,21f. e–e ≠ Sp II 515,23–26

² The parallel passage in Sp II 515,8–20 is much more explicit.

³ There are no provisions for a formal renunciation for bhikkhunīs who wish to leave the Saṅgha. If a bhikkhunī goes away on her own (*vibbhāmati*), this is counted as her informally quitting the Saṅgha (Vin II 279,28ff.), which makes her *abhiikkhunī*. Based on the interpretation of the Word Analysis in the Vinaya, where an excluded (*nāśitā*) nun is equated with one who left the Saṅgha informally (*vibbhantā*) (Vin IV 217,13ff.), a nun who informally left the order is considered equal to one defeated (*pārājika**) in commentarial literature, which implies that she cannot be ordained again. Vin II 279,28ff., however, does not contain an explicit statement prohibiting the reordination of such a former nun. This is only expressed for a Buddhist nun who had turned to non-Buddhist ascetics and later comes back to the Buddhist Saṅgha (Vin II 279,33ff.). So it might be that the prohibition of reordination of nuns did not belong to the original rules. Cf. Kieffer-Pülz 2015–16: 23.

⁴ Here again Sp II 515,26–16,3 is more explicit.

⁵ Vin III 35,35–38 says this means he can penetrate his own anus (details not given in BD I 55). See Kieffer-Pülz 2001: 67ff. [2014: 355], and Perera 1993: § 226.

⁶ Vin I 35,33–36 says this means he can take his own penis in his mouth. See Kieffer-Pülz 2001: 67 [2014: 354]; Perera 1993: § 216. Sp I 277,31 describes this person as a *nāta-pubbaka* “former acrobat”.

⁷ This certainly refers to Vin V 167,20ff. (*methunadhammassa anulomap jānitabban ti: bhikkhu attano mukhena parassa aṅgajātām gañhāti*. “He should know the proper order of sexual intercourse means: the monk takes hold of

126 *Bhikkhupātimokha: C. Rules Entailing Defeat*

⟨56⟩

^f—Thus, putting together these four and the previous twenty, twenty-four *pārājika* in all are to be known.

He no [longer] obtains communal life together with [other] bhikkhus (na labhati bhikkhūhi saddhim saṃvāsan̄i, Pāt 10,10–11) means: he does not obtain communal life consisting in the observance, etc., together with the bhikkhus.²

As [he was] before [ordination] so [he is] after (yathā pure, tathā pacchā, Pāt 10,11) means: as [he was] before (alternative form), at the time of [being] a householder and at the time of being unordained; after, when he indeed has committed [an offence entailing] defeat, he likewise is one [who incurs] the loss of communal life. For him there is no communal life consisting in the observance, etc., together with the bhikkhus.

There I ask the venerable ones (tatth' āyasmante pucchāmi, Pāt 10,13) means: in respect of these four [rules entailing] defeat I ask the venerable ones, “Are you pure in this?”

kacci 'ttha (Pāt 10,15) means: *kacci* (interrogative pronoun) *ettha* (“in this”) (filling the ellipsis). The meaning is “Are you pure in respect of [35] these four [rules entailing] defeat?” Alternatively, *kacci 'ttha par-isuddhā* (Pāt 10,15) means: “Are you (*attha*) pure?” The meaning is: “Have you become [pure]?” The remainder is entirely clear throughout.^{—f}

The commentary on the section of [rules] entailing defeat of the *Kaṅkhāvitaranī*, the commentary on the *Pātimokha*, is finished.

^f—^f ≠ Sp II 516,3–18

another's male organ with his own mouth”, *BD VI* 271), but there seem to be no references in other parts of the Vinaya.

¹ All the cases in Vin refer to women sitting down on bhikkhus.

² Sp II 516,6f., 21f. in addition to the observance day (*uposatha*) mentions the invitation (*pavāraṇā*) and the recitation of the *Pātimokha* as procedures of the Sangha. *Samvāsa** here is used in the usual sense against the special meaning it has in Kkh 29,23f. (see above, p. 60, n. 5).

Page 175 job: 1272818

⟨57⟩ *Saṅghādisesa 1 M* 127

⟨57⟩ [D. The Section of Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting of the Saṅgha]

[Now, venerable sirs, these thirteen rules entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha come up for recitation.

(Pāt 12,2f. = Vin III 110,1f.)]

Now, these (ime kho pana, Pāt 12,2) means: turning towards [the rules] now to be mentioned.

Venerable sirs (āyasmanto, Pāt 12,2), [this is] an address in a pleasing way to those who are assembled.

Thirteen (terasa, Pāt 12,2) means: the limit by counting.

Entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha (saṅghādisesā, Pāt 12,2) means: [the rules] named thus.

Rules (dhammā, Pāt 12,2) means: offences.

Come up for recitation (uddesam āgacchanti, Pāt 12,3) means: the [rules] come up for being recited in their proper form, not as in the introduction with a mere general statement [such as] for whom there may be an offence (Pāt 4,14 = Vin I 103,2).

[1. The commentary on the rule about the emission of semen.]

[1. Sgh M: Intentional emission of semen, unless [it is] in a dream, entails a formal meeting of the Saṅgha.

(Pāt 12,5f. = Vin III 112,17f.)]¹

g—Intentional (sañcetanikā, Pāt 12,5): [there] is consciousness (cetanā) of it² means intention (lit. with consciousness; sañcetanā);³ intention (sañcetanā) indeed is intention (sañcetanikā),⁴ or, alternatively, that [which] has intention.^{1—g}

g—gSp III 518,29ff.

¹ For comments regarding this rule, see von Hinüber 1999: 39.

² assā stands for sukkavisaṭṭhi, f., “emission of semen” (Kkh-nṭ 225,8 = Sp-t II 300,14f.).

³ The commentary, as usual, first explains the word forming the base (in this case sañcetanā) of the word actually discussed (sañcetanika).

⁴ According to the first alternative, sañcetanā and sañcetanikā are the same in meaning, that is, “intention”. As stated in the commentaries -ika does not have a separate meaning here (Kkh-nṭ 225,8ff. = Sp-t II 300,15f.: imasmim vikappe ika-

128 *Bhikkhupātimokha: D. Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting* (57)

Emission of semen (*sukkavisatthi*, Pāt 12,5) means: emission of semen (resolution of compound); the meaning is: the moving from its place of some semen or other among the ten sorts of semen — [ten] by virtue of [being] blue, etc.,² due to the diversity of secretions and elements³ — of a [bhikkhu] who, when [his] penis for some reason or other among “erection due to sexual passion”, etc.,⁴ has reached readiness,

saddassa visum attho natthī ti āha sañcetanā va sañcetanikā ti (Kkh 57,14 = Sp III 518,13). “In this alternative there is no separate meaning of the word *-ika*, therefore [the commentator] says: **intention indeed is intention.**”). *Sañcetanikā* in this meaning is not listed in Childers, and *PED*, where only the adjective (-*ika*) with the meaning “intentional” is given.

¹ Lit. “intention belongs to it (that is, emission of semen)”. See Sp-ṭ II 300,16ff.: *idāni sam-saddassa attham anapekkhitvā ika-saddo va assatthi-attham pakāsetī ti dassento sañcetanā vā assā atthī ti sañcetanikā ti* (Sp 518,30) *dutiyavikappam āha*. “Now without considering the meaning of the word *sam*, showing that the word *-ika* indeed indicates the possessive meaning (lit. ‘the meaning, it belongs to it’) [the commentator] mentions the second alternative: **or [that which] has intention [is] intentional.**” Similarly, Kkh-ṇṭ 252,10f.: *idāni ika-saddo va atthi attham pakāsetī ti dassento sañcetanā vā ti* (Kkh 57,14) *ādim āha*.

² The other nine are: yellow, red, white, the colour of buttermilk, the colour of water, the colour of sesamum oil, the colour of milk, the colour of curds, the colour of ghee (Vin III 112,21ff.).

³ See Sp III 519,14f.: *tattha sukkānam āsayabhedato dhātunānattato ca nīlādi-vanṇabhedo veditabbo*. “There, the sort of colours — blue, etc. — has to be known due to the sort of secretion and the diversity of the elements of semen.” Cf. Kkh-ṇṭ 226,9ff.: *āsāyadhātunānatto ti* (Kkh 57,19) *pittasemhapubba-lohitāsayānañ c’ eva pathavīdhātu-ādīnañ ca catunnañ dhātūnañ, rasa-soṣitādīnañ vā sattannañ dhātūnañ nānāttato*. “**Due to the diversity of secretions and elements** means: due to the diversity of the four secretions, [that is,] bile, phlegm, pus, and blood, as well as the [four] elements — earth-element, etc. — or due to the diversity of the seven elements — essential fluid, blood, etc.”

⁴ The other forms of erection are erection due to excrement, to urine, to wind, and to the bite of a kind of vermin (see Vin III 112,32–35; 113,12–21; translation Kieffer-Pülz 2001: 72f. (2014: 359f.); cf. Kkh-ṇṭ 225,18f.: *ādi-saddena* (Kkh 57,16) *vaccūpatthambha-passāvūpatthambha-vātipatthambha-uccāliṅga-pānakadatthūpatthambhānam gahanam*).

⟨58⟩*Saṅghādisesa 1 M*

129

| masturbates, [using] something or other among “his own form”, etc.,¹
| with the intention of enjoying the emission [of semen] having used as a
| pretext something or other among “good health”, etc.²

| Unless [it is] in a dream (*aññatratra supinantā*, Pāt 12,5) means: what-
| ever emission of semen there is in a dream, except for that.

| Entails a formal meeting of the Saṅgha³ (*saṅghādiseso*, Pāt 12,5f.)
| the meaning is: h—whatever intentional emission of semen there is,
| unless [it is] in a dream, this is a category of offence called “entails a
| formal meeting of the Saṅgha” (*saṅghādiseso*). But the meaning of the
| word in this connection [is]: a Saṅgha is required at the beginning and
| in the remainder of it,⁴ [that means] “entails a formal meeting of the
| Saṅgha”. What ⟨58⟩ is said [by this]? Having committed [such an]
| offence, for the one who wishes [its] removal, whatever is the removal
| of [that] offence, a Saṅgha is required, in the beginning of that
| [removal] for the sake of imposing probation; in the rest [starting from]
| the beginning, [that is] in the middle, for the sake of imposing the
| *mānatta* [penance] or for imposing the *mānatta* [penance] together with
| sending back to the beginning; and at the end for the sake of rehabili-
| tation. For, in that respect, not even a single procedure can be performed
| without a Saṅgha. Thus a Saṅgha is required at the beginning and in the
| remainder, [that is the meaning of] *saṅghādisesa*.^{—h}

| h—hSp III 521,32–22,10

¹ This *ādi* refers to the four means (*upāya*, see Sp III 522,27f.) by which ejaculation
| may be effected, with or through one’s own form, an external form, one’s own
| and an external form, or by making one’s hip swing in the air; see Vin III
| 112,31f., translation Kieffer-Pülz 2001: 72f. (2014: 360f.).

² The Vinaya lists ten reasons for which one might emit semen, “for health”
| being the first; see Vin III 112,35–13,2, transl. Kieffer-Pülz 2001: 73f. (2014:
| 360f.).

³ For the various renderings of the word Saṅghādisesa, see above, pp. 4f., n. 4.

⁴ Kkh-nṭ 227,10–16 ≠ Sp-t II 314,11–17: *assā ti* (Kkh 57,24 = Sp III 522,3) *assa*
| (Kkh-nṭ om.) *āpattinikāyassa. nanu ca ayutto ‘yam niddeso “saṅgho ādimhi*
| *c’ eva sese ca icchitabbo assā” ti. na hi āpattinikāyassa ādimhi c’ eva sese ca*
| *saṅgho icchito. kiñ carahi vutthānassā ti imāpi codanāpi manasi sannidhāya*
| *yathā na virujjhati, tathā adhīppāyāpi vivaranto kiñ vuttañ hotī ti*
| (Kkh 57,24–58,1 = Sp III 522,3f.) *ādim āha. āpattito vutthānassa ādimhi c’ eva*
| *sese ca icchito saṅgho āpattiyyā va icchito nāma hotī ti ayam ettha adhīppāyo.*

130 *Bhikkhupātimokha: D. Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting* (58)

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Seyyasaka (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “emission of impurity” (i.e. semen) after having masturbated (= 3. *subject matter*).

This, [i.e.] “unless [it is] in a dream” (*aññatratrā supinantā*, Pāt 12,5; Kkh 57,21), is the supplementary prescription (*anupaññatti*) here (i.e. in Sgh 1 M).

[The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

If, however, [a bhikkhu] causes an ejaculation in making another one masturbate his (i.e. the bhikkhu’s) own penis, he commits an offence indeed. For [a bhikkhu] who, having thought of [emitting semen], exerts himself with respect to his penis even so much as by shaking his hips in the air, if [the semen] is not emitted, [it is] a grave offence. But if even so much as a small fly might drink is released from its [storage] space, [it is an offence entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha, even if [the semen] did not descend to the water (urine) passage.¹ But if [the semen] is streamed forth from its [storage] space, it inevitably descends to the water (urine) passage, therefore it is said in the commentaries, “[It is an offence entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha [even] if [the semen] merely descends to the water (urine) passage, whether it goes outside or does not go out” (Sp III 520,4f.) (= 6. [sorts of] *offence*).

There is no offence for one not masturbating and for one having no intention of emission and for one seeing a dream and for one who is insane, etc., even if [semen] is emitted (= 7. *non-offence*).

It is a failure of virtuous conduct (= 8. *failure*).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) intention, [36] (ii) masturbation, [and] (iii) emission (= 9. *constituent factors*).

¹ *daka-sota*, literally means “water passage”. In all explanations, however, *sota* in this compound is replaced by *magga* and *daka* by *mutta* or *passāva* “urine”. *Daka-sota* therefore describes the opening of the urethra through which the semen on its way from its storage places within the body enters the sexual organ. The Saṅghādisesa offence arises as soon as the semen leaves its storage places in the body, be it the tip of the bladder (*vatthisīsa*), the hip, or in the whole body. Cf. Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I [Z 106].

⟨59⟩*Saṅghādisesa 2 M*

131

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc.,¹ are exactly the same as stated in the first [rule entailing] defeat (Pāt 1 M).

The commentary on the rule about the emission of semen² is finished.

[2. The commentary on the rule about bodily contact]

[2. Sgh M: *If any bhikkhu should, beset [by passion], with perverted thought, engage in bodily contact with a woman or holding of hands or holding of locks of hair or touching of this or that limb, [this entails] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha.*

(Pāt 12,8–11 = Vin III 120,33–36)] **⟨59⟩**

In the second [rule]³ i—*beset* (*otinno*, Pāt 12,8) means: beset by passion arising inside — as beings are beset by demons, etc. — or descended into passion of his own accord being attached to a lustful matter — as beings not paying attention to pits, etc., [descend (i.e. fall) into them].^{–i}
This is a designation for one being possessed by passion for bodily contact.

j—*With perverted thought* (*vipariṇatena cittena*, Pāt 12,8) means: with [a thought] turned otherwise, leaving the nature which is called the pure existence continuum, or [with a thought] turned towards the unshapely;^{–j} k—as something turning around becomes unshapely, with a thought remaining turned around by virtue of the passion described thus, [this is] the meaning^{–k}

l—*With a woman* (*mātugāmena saddhiṃ*, Pāt 12,8f.) means: with a living human female, even one born that day.

a—*Should engage in bodily contact* (*kāyasamsaggam samāpajjeya*, Pāt 12,9) means: should engage in the joining of bodies consisting of the holding of hands, etc., [i.e.] the mixing of bodies.^{–a}

b—*But or in holding of hands* (*hatthaggāham vā*, Pāt 12,9), etc., shows the meaning of it at length. There^{–b} “hand” means: from the

i—i Sp III 532,24ff. j—j Sp III 533,4ff. k—k ≠ Sp III 533,6f. a—a Sp III 533,15f.
b—b Sp III 533,21f.

¹ “Etc.”, refers to the remaining six factors, 11. *kiriyā*, 12. *saññāvīmokkhā*, 13. *sacittaka*, 14. *lokavajja*, 15. *kamma*, and 17. *vedanā*; see above, pp. 81ff.

² Kkh 58,21 *sakka*^o to be corrected to *sukka*^o.

³ For this rule, see von Hinüber 1999: 39.

132 *Bhikkhupātimokha: D. Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting* 〈60〉

elbow to the tip of the nails.¹ “Locks of hair” means: this is the designation for a mass of hair plaited or unplaited, made either with pure [unmixed] hair, or mixed with one or another of threads of blue colour, [etc.], or garlands of flowers or coins or strips of gold or strings of pearls, etc.²

And in this context, by holding of locks of hair (*veṇiggahanena*, Pāt 12,8), also the hair of the head is in fact included, together with the hair of the body. Thus “holding of hands” (*hattha-gāho*) is the holding of a hand with the [above] mentioned characteristics (resolution of compound); “holding of locks of hair” (*veṇi-ggāho*) is the holding of locks of hair (resolution of compound).

The touching of the rest of the body is the touching of this or that limb (*aññatarassa vā aññatarassa vā aṅgassa parāmasanam*, Pāt 12,10f.). Whoever engages in that holding of hands or holding of locks of hair or that touching of this or that limb, for him there is the category of offence called “entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha”.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Elder Udāyi (= 2. *individual*), with respect to the subject matter of engaging in bodily contact (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

〈60〉 [It is an offence entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha, even for one touching with even so much as his body hair the body hair of a woman thinking that it is a woman, or for one who, being touched by a woman, making an effort [with his body] with the intention of sexual intercourse acknowledges the touch. But for one holding her with one hand and touching her here and there with the other hand, even for a [whole] day, [it is] only one offence. Not holding her, but touching her from head to foot, as long as he touches her without in fact taking his hand from her body, [it is] only one offence. Even in the holding of five fingers at one time, [it is] only one [offence]. But if he holds five fingers of various women at one time, [there are] five offences. For one who

¹ This is the definition of *hattha** (translated as “cubit” when used as a measure) as given in Vin III 121,9 [Sgh 2 M]; IV 221,10f. [Pār 4 N].

² A shorter definition of *veṇi* is given Vin III 121,9ff. [Sgh 2 M].

⟨60⟩

Saṅghādisesa 2 M

133

|doubts whether she is a woman, and for one who thinks that it is a
|eunuch¹ or man or animal [it is] a grave offence.² Likewise also in the
|case of bodily contact with non-human females and eunuchs by means
|of the body [or] something attached to the body [it is a grave offence].³
|But in the case of [touching] something attached to the body, etc., of a
|human female by means of something attached to the body⁴ and in the
|case of the touching, etc., of a male body,⁵ [it is an offence of] wrong
|doing (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

|There is no offence for one who, being touched by a woman, although
|with the intention of sexual intercourse, without making an effort with
|his body, [37] acknowledges the touch, for one touching a woman with
|the intention of freeing [himself from her],⁶ for one [acting] unintentionally,
|because of forgetfulness, for one not knowing, for one not con-
|senting, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

|It is a failure of virtuous conduct (= 8. failure).

|These are the five constituent factors here: (i) a human female,
|(ii) thinking that it is a female, (iii) passion for bodily contact, (iv) effort
|because of that passion, [and] (v) engaging in hand-holding, etc. (= 9. con-
|stituent factors).

|The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc.,⁷ are exactly the same as
|stated in the first [rule entailing] defeat (i.e. Pār 1 M).

|The commentary on the rule about bodily contact is finished.

¹ *pandaka*; see above, p. 73, n. 1.

² See Vin III 121,30ff.

³ See the casuistry in Vin III 121,37–22,4.

⁴ For these special forms of touching by means of something attached to the
|body, see Kieffer-Püllz 2013: I [Z 108], esp. n. 11.

⁵ In the case of a male body, the touching always leads only to an offence of
|wrong doing, even if it is a bodily contact, and not only one by virtue of some-
|thing attached to one's body, see Vin III 122,5ff.

⁶ *mokkhādhippāyena* (not *mocanādhippāyena*), cf. Vin IV 146,28 [Pāc 74 M],
|BD III 48; Vin IV 147,22f. [Pāc 75 M], BD III 50; cf. Kkh-ṇṭ 229,15: *mokkhādhi-*
ppāyenā ti (Kkh 60,15) *itthito muccitukāmatādhippāyena*. “With the inten-
|tion to free [himself] means: with the intention consisting in the wish to free
|[himself] from the woman.”

⁷ “Etc.”, refers to the remaining factors, 11. *kiriya*, 12. *saññāvīmokkha*, 13. *sacittaka*,
|14. *lokavajja*, 15. *kamma*, 16. *citta*, and 17. *vedanā*, see above, pp. 81ff.

134 *Bhikkhupātimokha: D. Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting* (61)

[3. The commentary on the rule about lewd speech]

[3. Sgh M: *If any bhikkhu should, beset [by passion], with perverted thought, insult¹ a woman with lewd words, as a young man [addresses] a young girl [with words] alluding to sexual intercourse, [this entails] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha.*

(Pāt 12,13ff. = Vin III 128,21ff.)]

In the third [rule]² the state of being beset and the state of having a perverted thought are to be understood by virtue of a passion for pleasure [coming] from lewd words. (61)

Woman (*mātugāmāṇi*, Pāt 12,13) means: a human female capable of distinguishing between lewd and not lewd.

With lewd words (*dūṭhullāhi vācāhi*, Pāt 12,14) means: with words connected with sexual intercourse by the faeces orifice or the urine orifice.³

^c—*Should insult* (*obhāseyya*, Pāt 12,14) means: should insult (alternative verb form); should utter bad words of different forms by virtue of praise, blame, asking, appealing, questioning, counter-questioning, explaining, exhorting, abusing.^{—c}

^d—*As* (*yathā tam*, Pāt 12,14) means: Here *tam* is a mere particle. The meaning is: as a young man [insults] a young girl.^{—d} By this he shows the state of non-doubt regarding the insulting (i.e. offensive speech).

[*With words*] *alluding to sexual intercourse* (*methunupasamhitāhi*, Pāt 12,15) means: this is showing the most extreme characteristic⁴ of lewd words.

Entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha (*saṅghādiseso*, Pāt 12,15) means: there is a category of offence called “entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha” for one insulting a woman with praise or blame by virtue of the two orifices,⁵ or with asking, etc., for sexual intercourse, or by an

^{c—c}Sp III 547,10f. ^{d—d}Sp III 547,15f.

¹ In Pāt *obhāseyya* was translated by “address”, which, however, seems a little weak. We, therefore, replace it by “insult”.

² For this rule, see von Hinüber 1999: 39.

³ This is how Vin-vn-ṭ resolves the compound (Vin-vn-ṭ I 179,6f.: *vaccamagga-passāvamagge methunadhammapatisamyuttā vācā*).

⁴ *sikhāpatta*, Childers s.v. “means, I think, ‘pre-eminent, highest’, lit. having reached the pinnacle”; see also UC I 213, n. 844.

⁵ The two orifices, lit. “ways”, are the anus (*vacca-magga*), and the vagina (*passāvamagga*), see Vin III 128,33; cf. 129,4ff.

⟨61⟩

Saṅghādisesa 3 M

135

| abusing utterance among one or other of these three: “You are one with
| a protruding [piece of flesh],¹ you are one with mixed [orifices],² you
| are one with the marks of both sexes” (i.e. a hermaphrodite).³

| [This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning
| Elder Udāyi (= 2. *individual*), with respect to the subject matter “insult-
| ing with lewd words” (= 3. *subject matter*).

| [The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

| It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

| For one insulting a woman, thinking that it is a woman, in the stated
| way with even so much as a hand gesture, if she understands that mean-
| ing at that very moment, [it is an offence entailing] a formal meeting of
| the Saṅgha.⁴ In the case of a eunuch⁵ [it is] a grave offence. In that same
| case [of a eunuch], for one thinking it is a woman, [it is an offence of]
| wrong doing. For one insulting again and again and for one insulting
| many women with a single utterance, there are offences in accordance
| with the number of utterances and the number of women. If the woman
| he insults does not understand, [it is] a grave offence. Even in speaking
| praise, etc., with reference to what is below the collar-bone and above
| the circles of the knees [it is] a grave offence. In the case of a eunuch [it
| is an offence of] wrong doing. In speaking praise, etc., with reference to
| [what is] above the collar bone, below the circles of the knees, and to
| anything attached to the body, [it is an offence of] wrong doing
| through-out (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

| There is no offence for those devoted to [explaining] the meaning, the

¹ Kkh-nt 230,22 = Sp III 548,20f.: *sikharanī ti* (Kkh 61,13 = Sp III 548,20f.) *bahi nikhanta-ānimamsā*. This is a prolapse of the vagina. Cf. Hüskens 1997a: 410, n. 279.

² Kkh-nt 230,22f. = Sp III 548,23: *sambhinnā ti* (Kkh 61,13 = Sp III 548,23) *sambhinnavaccamaggapassāvamaggā*. Here the anal and the vaginal channels are joined, cf. Hüskens 1997a: 411, n. 282.

³ Sp III 548,23ff., cf. Hüskens 1997a: 411, n. 283. These three subjects belong to the stumbling blocks preventing women from being ordained.

⁴ If we compare this classification to that of Sgh 4 M, it is to be supposed that in the present case a line of the text of Kkh was lost, namely: “If she does not understand, it is a grave offence.”

⁵ *pandaka*, see above, p. 73, n. 1.

136 *Bhikkhupātimokha: D. Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting* 〈62〉

teaching, and the instruction;¹ and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

It is a failure of virtuous conduct (= 8. *failure*).

These are the five constituent factors here: (i) a human female, (ii) thinking that it is a female, (iii) a passion for pleasure [coming] from lewd words, 〈62〉 (iv) insulting because of that passion, (v) understanding at that very instant (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The [offence against this rule has the] origin of [the rule about] taking what is not given (Pār 2 M) (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*),

- [it originates in] activity (= 11. *activity*),
- [has] acquittal due to [lacking] awareness (= 12. *awareness*),
- [is dependent on] intention (*sacittaka*) (= 13. *intention*),
- [is] a fault according to common opinion (= 14. *fault*),
- [is] a physical deed, a verbal deed (= 15. *deeds*),
- [is done with an] unwholesome [type of] thought (= 16. *thought*),
- [with] two [types of] feeling (= 17. *feelings*).

The commentary on the rule about lewd speech is finished.

[4. The commentary on the rule about ministering
to his own sensual pleasure]

[4. Sgh M: *If any bhikkhu should, beset [by passion], with perverted thought, in the presence of a woman, speak in praise of ministering to his own sensual pleasure [saying], “Sister, this is the highest of ministries, if any [woman] should minister with this act to one like me, virtuous, of noble nature, one who lives the holy life”, [with an utterance] alluding to sexual intercourse, [this entails] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha.*

(Pāt 12,17–21 = Vin III 133,12–16)]

In the fourth [rule] the state of being beset and the state of having a perverted thought are to be understood by virtue of ministering to one's own sensual pleasures.

¹ Cf. Vin III 130,13f.: *anāpatti athapurekkhārassa, dhammapurekkhārassa, anusāsanīpurekkhārassa, ummmattakassa, ādikammikassā ti*. “There is no offence if he displays the meaning, if he displays the teaching, if he displays an instruction, if he is mad, if he is the first one to do the act.” Following Kkh-nt 232,3ff., *attha* simply is the meaning of a word here, “teaching” refers to the canonical text, and *anusāsanī* is the instruction.

⟨62⟩

Saṅghādisesa 4 M

137

In the presence of a woman (*mātugāmassa santike*, Pāt 12,17f) means: close to a female of the sort mentioned in [the rule about] insulting with lewd words (i.e. Sgh 3 M).¹ [38]

^e-*Attakāmapāricaryāyā*² (Pāt 12,18) means: ministering with sensual pleasure called sexual intercourse is “ministering with sensual pleasure” (*kāma-pāricaryā*); ministering with sensual pleasure for the sake of oneself (resolution of compound) is “ministering with sensual pleasure for oneself” (*atta-kāma-pāricaryā*). Alternatively, “pleasure for oneself” (*atta-kāmā*) means loved and wished for by oneself. The meaning is: loved by oneself by virtue of passion for sexual intercourse. The ministering, which is pleasure for oneself (resolution as a karmadhāraya compound) is *atta-kāma-pāricaryāyā*; of that *atta-kāma-pāricaryāyā*.

Should speak in praise (*vāṇṇam bhāseyya*, Pāt 12,18) means: he should illustrate good quality and advantage.^{-e}

This is the highest (*etad aggam*, Pāt 12,18), etc., means: showing the way of praising ministering to his own sensual pleasure.

There, the [following] is the condensed meaning by virtue of the [syntactical] connection of the words:³ If any (*yā*, Pāt 12,19) [woman] should minister (*paricareyya*, Pāt 12,20; i.e.) should delight, ^f-with this act (*etena dhammena*, Pāt 12,20) one like me (*mādisam*, Pāt 12,19) who is virtuous (*sīlavantam*, Pāt 12,19) by reason of abstention from killing living creatures, one who lives the holy life (*brahmacārim*, Pāt 12,20) by reason of abstinence from sexual intercourse, lofty natured (*kalyāṇa-*

^e-^eSp III 551,16-22 ^f-^fSp III 552,16ff.

¹ For this rule, see von Hinüber 1999: 39.

² In the translation of the Pātimokkha, this is rendered as “of ministering to his own sensual pleasure”. Since here several meanings of the compound *atta-kāma-pāricaryā* are discussed, we leave the lemma untranslated.

³ *tatrāyam padasambandhavasen’ eva saṅkhepattho*. This and similar phrases regularly introduce a paragraph. Therefore the following text printed as a new paragraph in the edition of Kkh (62,24ff.) has to be directly attached. In Kkh this is the only occasion of a *saṅkhepattho* given. As a base for this contextual presentation serves the sentence handed down at the parallel passage of Sp III 552,3-7: *ayam pan’ ettha padasambandho cā āpattivinicchayo ca: etad aggam ... pe ... paricareyyā ti* (Vin III 133,13ff.) *yā mādisam sīlavantam kalyāṇadhammam brahmacārim etena dhammena paricareyya tassā evam mādisam paricarantiyā yā ayam pāricaryā nāma etad aggam pāricaryānan ti.*

138 *Bhikkhupātimokkha: D. Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting* 〈63〉

dhammam, Pāt 12,19f.) because of both of these, that ministry of her thus ministering to one like me is called *this is the highest of ministries* (*etad aggam pāricariyānam*, Pāt 12,18f.).

[With an utterance] alluding to sexual intercourse, [this entails] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha (*methunupasamhitena saṅghādiseso*, Pāt 12,21) means: 〈63〉 and speaking thus in praise of ministering to his own sensual pleasure,—f whoever should speak with an utterance in fact connected with sexual intercourse — “such as you ought to grant me sexual intercourse”, etc. — for him [it is an offence entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Elder Udāyi (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “speaking praise of ministering to his own sensual pleasure” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

For a [man] speaking praise of ministering to his own sensual pleasure to a woman, thinking that it is a woman, exactly in the stated way with even so much as a hand gesture, if she understands that meaning at that very moment, [it is an offence entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha. If she does not understand, [it is] a grave offence. In the case of a eunuch [it is] a grave offence even for one knowing it is a eunuch. In that same case [of a eunuch], for one thinking it is a woman, [it is an offence of] wrong doing (= 6. *sorts of offence*).

There is no offence for one speaking praise of ministering because of desires for possessions such as robes, etc., and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

It is a failure of virtuous conduct (= 8. *failure*).

These are the five constituent factors here: (i) a human female, (ii) thinking that it is a female, (iii) passion for ministering to one’s own sensual pleasure, (iv) speaking praise because of that passion, (v) understanding at that very instant (= 9. *constituent factors*).

Page 187 job: 1272818

⟨64⟩ *Saṅghādisesa 5 M* 139

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc.¹ are exactly the same as stated in the [rule about] insulting with lewd words² (Sgh 3 M).

The commentary on the rule about ministering to his own sensual pleasures is finished.

[5. The commentary on the rule about acting as a go-between]

[5. Sgh M: *If any bhikkhu should act as a go-between, [conveying] either a man's intentions to a woman or a woman's intentions to a man, in respect of being a wife or being a lover [or] even as a temporary [wife, this entails] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha.*

(Pāt 14,2ff. = Vin III 139,7ff.)

In the fifth [rule]³ *go-between* (*sañcarittam*, Pāt 14,2) means: the state of going between men and women.

Should act (*samāpajjeyya*, Pāt 14,2) means: should act doing properly accepting, investigating, [and] bringing back.

Either to a woman (*itthiyā vā*, Pāt 14,2), etc., is an indication of the form of the activity.

There, *a man's intentions to a woman* (*itthiyā vā purisamatīm*, Pāt 14,2f.) means: sent by the man or his parents, etc., [the bhikkhu] should announce the man's intention (*matīm*) — [i.e.] intent (*adhippāya*) — to the woman.

Or the woman's intention to the man (*purisassa vā itthimatiṃ*, Pāt 14,3) means: sent by the woman or her parents, etc., [the bhikkhu] should announce the woman's intention (*matīm*) — [i.e.] intent (*adhippāya*) — to the man.

In respect of being a wife or being a lover (*jāyattane vā jārattane vā*, Pāt 14,3f.) means: in respect of being a wife (*jāyabhāve*) or in respect of being a lover (*jārabhāve*) (alternative words). ^gFor, announcing a man's ⟨64⟩ intention to a woman he announces in respect of being a

^ggSp III 554,15–18

¹ Nos. 11–17 of the classification.

² The reference to Sgh 3 M is given here with the keyword *dūṭhullobhāsane*, which takes up the words *dūṭhullāhi vācāhi obhāseyya* from the rule. The rule itself, however, is called *dūṭhulla-vācā-sikkhāpada* in Kkh (60,22–62,5), and referred to as *dūṭhulla-vācā* in Sp (III 552,21).

³ For this rule, see von Hinüber 1999: 39.

140 *Bhikkhupātimokkha: D. Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting* 〈64〉

wife, or announcing a woman's intention to a man he announces in respect of being a lover; moreover, announcing in fact a man's intention to a woman, he announces in respect of being a wife in the state of permanent wife, or he announces in respect of being a mistress in a state of wrong behaviour.^g For that very reason it is said in the Word Analysis to this,^h i—“‘Either in the state of being a wife’ means ‘You will be a wife’; ‘or in the state of being a lover’ means ‘You will be a mistress.’”^h In exactly the same way, also, in announcing a woman's intention to a man, the fact of having to say, “You will be a husband”, “You will be [her] lover” [39] is to be understood.

Even as a temporary [wife] (*antamaso taikhanikāya pi*, Pāt 14.4) means: that one which is called “a temporary [wife]”, because she — according to the smallest period of time — has to live together for one instant, i.e. for a mere moment; the meaning is “a temporary [wife]”. For [a bhikkhu] announcing the man's intention thus, “You will be his temporary wife”, [it is an offence entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha. In exactly the same way, also, [a bhikkhu] announcing a woman's intention to a man thus, “You will be her temporary [husband]”, is to be understood as one who commits [an offence entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha.ⁱ

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Elder Udāyi (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “acting as a go-between” (= 3. *subject matter*).

This “even being a temporary [wife]” (*antamaso taikhanikāya pi*, Pāt 14.4) is the supplementary prescription (*anupaññatti*) here (i.e. in Sgh 5 M). [The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

“He accepts, he investigates, he causes a pupil to bring [the answer] back”, in this way it is connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

Except for whatever woman ought not to be repudiated,¹ a [bhikkhu] announcing a man's intention — even to his mother — being desirous of saying, “Will she be a wife bought by money”, even if having announced

^{h-h}Vin III 139,16f. ⁱ⁻ⁱSp III 554,21-30

¹ If a bhikkhu acts as a go-between between a husband and his wife, which is not repudiated, this is no offence (Vin III 144,15f.).

⟨65⟩

Saṅghādisesa 5 M

141

it by one expression or other among “one who dwells by [her own free] will”,¹ etc.,² — whether it is agreed by her with the word “good” or whether it is not agreed — coming back again he announces that matter to the man by whom he was sent, he commits [an offence entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha. But whether she becomes his wife or not is irrelevant. Even if not seeing the woman to whose presence he was sent, [then] saying “Tell [her]” to somebody who will inevitably inform [her], he brings [the answer] back, he indeed commits [an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha].

^{3-j}—But for one being sent with the words, “Speak to the one protected by her mother”, [and] having gone, [he] speaks to one of those protected by their father, etc., it is a flawed appointment.^{3-j} ⟨65⟩ Having accepted the answer “good” of the man or woman by body or voice or both, having announced or having had announced [this answer] to the [respective] woman or man,⁴ for him, announcing that matter again himself to the man by whom he was sent, or causing it to be told by another, [it is an offence entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha. For, with this much: (i) he accepts, (ii) he investigates, [and] (iii) he brings [the answer] back, the three constituent factors are in fact fulfilled. But with any two constituent factors of these — in case of a eunuch, however (*ca*), with all three constituent factors — [it is] a grave offence.” [With] one

^{j-j}Sp III 557,13ff.

¹ IBH translates “kept for passion” (*BD* I 238), understanding *chando* as “passion” instead of “will, consent” as did all the commentaries. Her translation of the commentary (*BD* I 238, n. 2) has to be corrected accordingly. Sp III 555,18ff: *chandena attano ruciyā vasatī ti chandavāsinī* (*Vin* III 139,24). *yasmā pana sā na attano chandamatten’ eva bhariyā hoti purisena pana sampaticchittatā, tasmāssa nid dese piyo piyām vāsetī ti* (*Vin* III 140,2) *vuttam*. “One who dwells by [her] own free will [with a man is] ‘one who dwells by her will’ (*chanda-vāsinī*). But since she is [his] wife not only by her own will, but because of [her] being accepted by the man, therefore it is said in the explanation to this [word]: **the dear one** (male) **makes the dear one** (female) **dwell**.” Kkh-nt 235,6-9 follows Sp.

² Ten types of wives beginning with *dhana-kkītā* and *chanda-vāsinī* are listed *Vin* III 139,24ff. (*BD* I 236f.).

³ Since the bhikkhu addressed a person different from the one he was asked to address, there is no mutual appointment.

⁴ Here the succession is the other way round because the counterparts to the man and woman mentioned in the beginning are meant.

142 *Bhikkhupātimokha: D. Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting* 〈65〉

[constituent part, it is an offence of] wrong doing (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one going because of some business of a Saṅgha or a shrine (*cetiya*) or one who is ill or for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

It is a failure of virtuous conduct (= 8. failure).

These are the five constituent factors here: (i) the human nature of those for whom he acts as a go-between, (ii) being repudiated [of a woman],¹ (iii) accepting, (iv) investigating, (v) bringing back (= 9. constituent factors).

It has six origins:² (i) his not knowing the rule, or the state that [a woman] is repudiated, receiving the message by bodily changes (gestures), similarly [also] having investigated, similarly [also] bringing back, [the offence] originates from physical action.

(ii.a) k-Being spoken to by someone [with the words], “Such-and-such a woman is coming; you should find out her intention”, having accepted [with the word] “good”, having spoken to her when she has come, then telling that man again when he has come, because it is not on account of something done by the body, [the offence] originates from verbal action.

(ii.b) Having accepted the message with the word “good”, having gone to her house for some other reason, or at the time of going

k-kSp III 560,11–19

¹ Literally, “not being not [formally] repudiated”. This takes up a case described in the Vinītavatthu of this rule (Vin III 144,13–16, BD I 244) where we learn that there is no offence for a monk who tries to reconcile a man and a woman, as long as the woman has not been formally repudiated, that is, divorced. Thus, for an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha to arise for a monk, it is a precondition that the woman has been repudiated.

² *cha-samuṭṭhānam*; this is the regular keyword used in Sp III 560,7, and elsewhere. Kkh states that “Whatever [offence] originates because of all six [origins] (origin 10.1–6), this is called “[an offence] having the origin of [the rule about] a go-between” (Kkh 37,4f.: *yā chahi pi samuṭṭhāti, ayañ sañcaritta-samuṭṭhānā nāma*). Accordingly, Kkh mentions this type of origin by the key word *sañcaritta-samuṭṭhānam* (Kkh 108,28 [Niss 4 M]; 110,7 [Niss 5 M]). But in two other cases the Kkh author uses *cha-samuṭṭhānam* instead: Kkh 65,12 (Sgh 5 M), and Sgh 6 M (Kkh 69,3), where the text is literally the same as in Sp.

⟨65⟩

Saṅghādisesa 6 M

143

elsewhere, seeing her and investigating with various words, and then again going away from there for some other reason, seeing that man at some time or other, informing him, [for him] also [the offence] originates from verbal action.

(iii) But one not knowing the rule, even if he is one whose taints are destroyed,^{-k} if he goes on his father's instruction, [and] says even to his repudiated mother, "Go serve my father", for him, [in] bringing [the answer] back, [the offence] ^aoriginates from physical action and verbal action.^{-a} These three [cases] have origins without intention (*acittaka-samuṭṭhāna*). [40] But for someone knowing both of them (i.e. the rule, and the fact that the woman is repudiated), engaging with these three methods, these same three are with intention because of the thought knowing both of them (= 10. [sorts of] origin).

^b-[The offence originates in] activity (= 11. *activity*),
 [has] no acquittal due to [lacking] awareness (= 12. *awareness*),
 [is] not [dependent on] intention (*acittaka*) (= 13. *intention*),
 [is] a fault according to a precept [laid down by the Buddha] (= 14. *fault*),
 [is] a physical deed, a verbal deed (= 15. *deeds*).

By virtue of a wholesome [mental state], etc.,¹ there are here three [types of] thought (= 16. *thoughts*).

By virtue of pleasant, etc., there are three [types of] feelings (= 17. *feelings*).^{-b}

The commentary on the rule about [acting
 as] a go-between is finished.

[6. The commentary on the rule about making a hut]

[6. Sgh M: *When a bhikkhu by his own begging is having a hut made, without a [lay] owner, [that is] intended for himself, it must be made according to the [prescribed] measurements. There, this is the measurement: in length, twelve spans of the current span; in width, seven [spans] inside. Bhikkhus are to be brought to appoint the site. By those bhikkhus a site not involving harm [to living creatures] is to be appointed*

^a-^aSp III 560,19 ^b-^bSp III 560,29ff.

¹ The other two are an unwholesome and a neutral type of thought.

144 *Bhikkhupātimokha: D. Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting* (66)

with a space around it. If a bhikkhu by his own begging should have a hut made on a site involving harm with no space around it, or if he should not bring bhikkhus to appoint the site, or if he should exceed the [prescribed] measurements, [this entails] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha.

(Pāt 14.6–14 = Vin III 149,10–18)] (66)

In the sixth [rule] ^c–*by begging* (*saññācikāya pana*, Pāt 14.6): Here, “begging” (*samyācikā/saññācikā*)¹ is called asking set in motion by oneself. Therefore, “by begging” (*saññācikāya*) is said [to mean] “by one’s own asking”. The meaning is “by the materials asked for by oneself”.^c Here, however, it is not suitable to ask for whatever belongs to another by virtue of cutting the root (i.e. and thus bringing it permanently into one’s own possession),² but it is suitable [to ask] for [something] temporarily. It is suitable to say, “Give me a man as an assistant for doing the work.” It is suitable to ask even for work that can be done by a man. “Work to be done by a man” means manual work to be done by a man, e.g., a carpenter, etc. It is suitable to ask, saying, “Give me work to be done by a man” or “Give me manual labour.” Manual labour namely is not [a physical] object, therefore ^d–it is suitable to ask [for it], whether or not one has been asked, “Why, sir, have you come?” There is no fault because of asking by intimation³ (*viññattipaccayā*). But deer hunters, etc., are not to be asked for their own labour.^d

A hut (*kuṭīm*, Pāt 14.6) means: one or another among “plastered inside”, etc.⁴ There, “plastered inside” means excluding ^e–the area for non-plastering consisting of pillars, rafters, doorposts, windows, and the smoke opening, etc.^e — in the remaining plaster area, inside the covering

^{c–e}Sp III 566,32–67,2 ^{d–d}≠ Sp III 562,2–5 ^{e–e}≠ Sp III 568,26f.

¹ As Schlingloff 1963: 543, shows, the Sanskrit equivalent to *saññācika* is *svayācita*, “begged for himself”.

² See Kkh-nṭ 237,11ff.: *mūlacchedavasenā ti* (Kkh 66,13) *mūlassa chindanavasena, parasantakabhāvato mocetvā attano santakanā katvā ti vuttaṇ hoti.*

“**By virtue of cutting the root** means: by virtue of cutting the root (resolution of compound); that is to say, having made it one’s own property in having it removed from another’s property.”

³ “Asking by intimation” may lead to an offence in certain cases, for example in Sekh 37 (Kieffer-Püzl 2013: II [Z 215]).

⁴ The others are *avalittā* and *ullittāvalittā*, see Vin III 149,23.

Page 193 job: 1272818

⟨67⟩ *Saṅghādisesa 6 M* 145

(i.e. the roof) joining it with the walls, plastered with lime or clay.¹
 “Plastered outside” means similarly plastered outside the covering just in the stated way. “Plastered inside and outside” means similarly plastered inside and outside the covering. ⟨67⟩

Having made (*kārayamānena*, Pāt 14.6) means: either making it himself or having it made by [giving] a command.²

^f—*Without a [lay] owner* (*assāmikam*, Pāt 14.7) means: [a hut] constructed without a donor.^{3–f}

^g—*Destined to himself* (*attuddesam*, Pāt 14.7) means: [saying,] “This [hut] is my dwelling house”, thus the self is the destination for this [hut, insofar as a hut is] destined to himself; that [which is] destined to himself.

It (i.e. the hut) *must be made according to the [prescribed] measurements* (*pamāṇikā kāretabbā*, Pāt 14.7) means: it must be made consistent with the measurement.

There, this is the measurement (*tatr' idam pamāṇam*, Pāt 14.7f.) means: this is the measurement of the hut.^{–g}

In length (*dīghaso*, Pāt 14.8) means: in length (*dīghato*).

Twelve spans of ^hthe current span (*dvādaśa vidatthiyō sugata-vidatthiyā*, Pāt 14.8): here “current⁴ span” (*sugata-vidatthi*) [is said] at

^{f–f} ≠ Sp III 561,18f. ^{g–g} Sp III 567,15–20 ^{h–h} Sp III 567,21ff.

¹ For a hut it is necessary that the plastering of the hut's walls is joined with that of the roof, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I [Z 118] dealing with Sgh 6 M.

² Sp discusses these terms at length, Sp III 567,6ff.

³ The text is disturbed, although it is transmitted in the same way in Kkh-nt̄. *Kāretā*, for which we have the variant *kāretvā*, does not fit in the text. If *kāretā* is nominative singular masculine of *kāreta(r)*, “one who builds”, we have to join *virahitam* with an unmentioned *kuṭīm*. If *kāretā* is a nominative singular or plural feminine of the perfect participle of *kāreti*, it must refer to the unmentioned *kuṭī*, which, however, as the governing word for *assāmikam*, should stand in the accusative. The reading *kāretvā* is probably an attempt to escape these problems. Possibly the fault appears because the author of Kkh took parts of this definition over from Sp, where it is formulated in the plural, Sp III 561,18f.: *assāmikāyo ti* (Vin III 144,26) *anissarāyo, kāretā* (so B^e; E^e *kāretvā*) *dāyakena virahitāyo ti attho*. “[Huts] without owners: without masters; the meaning is: they are built (*kāretā*) without a benefactor.” Here *kāretā* is understood as a nominative plural feminine of the perfect participle.

⁴ *sugata* is used as an adjective in combination with various measures, and means “current”. Since *sugata* also is an epithet of the Buddha, the word was

146 *Bhikkhupātimokha: D. Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting* 〈67〉

present [to be] three spans (*vidatthi**) of an average man; by a carpenter's cubit (*vaddhaki-hattha*) it is one and a half cubits (*hattha*).¹ By one, however, measuring the outside walls of the hut, the strong clay border which is first given¹ is not to be taken [into account]; the twelve spans (*vidatthi**) are to be measured by the border of the lump of chaff.²
i—If there is no need for a lump of chaff, he finishes [a hut] only with a strong clay plaster. [Then] just that is the limit.^{—i}

j—*Across (tiriyam, Pāt 14.9)* means: in width.^{—j}

Seven inside (satt' antarā, Pāt 14.9) means: not taking the limit outside the wall, according to the inside limit, seven current spans (*vidatthi**) is said to be the measurement. And here it is not suitable to increase the length or the width by diminishing the width or the length even a hair's tip measure, much less increase both [of them].

But whatever [building] — even if it is sixty cubits (*hattha*) in length — is [only] three cubits or less than four cubits in width [41] — where a bed consistent with the measurement cannot turn around here and there³

i—i Sp III 567,27f. j—j Sp III 567,28

misunderstood as referring to the Buddha at an early stage, see Schlingloff 1963: 543f.

¹ The walls of a hut are first plastered with clay (*mahā-mattika*) according to our text. This does conform with the image given in the Visuddhimagga (354,26–29), where the flesh on a skeleton is compared to clay (*mahā-mattikā*) smeared on a wall. Perhaps *mahā* in *mahā-mattikā* is not so much “large”, but “strong”. *Mahā-mattikam* is furthermore explained as *bhitti-lepanam*, “plaster of a wall” in Vmv II 11,11.

² As we know from the rules regarding painting a hut's walls, some colours did not stick to the wall, and in that case it was allowed to apply balls of chaff (*thusa-piñḍa*), Vin II 151,12f.: *anujānāmi bhikkhave thusapiñḍam datvā pāṇipākāya paṭibāhitvā setavaṇṇam nipātetun ti*. “I allow you, monks, having applied lumps of chaff [to the wall and] having ground it with a trowel, to put on whitewash.” IBH's translation of this passage is wrong; for details see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: III [Z 408] n. 6. Cf. the slightly deviating parallel in Sp III 567,24ff.: *minantena pana sabbapāṭhamam dinno mahāmattikapariyanto na gahetabbo, thusapiñḍapariyantena minitabbam, thusapiñḍass' ūpari setakammam abbohārikam*.

³ Not all texts agree that the question of whether a bed with the right measures that can be turned around within a building is a factor for the definition of a *kuti*. For details, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I [Z 115]. The right measure of a bed

⟨68⟩

Saṅghādisesa 6 M

147

|—¹—[i.e.] is not four cubits at the minimum^{—1} — that is not called a hut,
|therefore it is suitable [to build it].²

|^k—*Bhikkhus are to be brought to appoint the site (bhikkhū abhinettabbā vatthudesanāya, Pāt 14.9f.)* means: in whatever place he desires to
|build a hut,^{—k} having cleaned it, having asked the Saṅgha three times in
|the way stated in the Word Analysis,³ either all those included in the
|Saṅgha or two or three bhikkhus agreed upon by the Saṅgha ^a—must be
|brought to appoint the site there.^{—a}⟨68⟩

|*By those bhikkhus a site not involving harm [to living creatures] is*
|*to be appointed with a space around it (tehi bhikkhūhi vatthu desetabbam*
|anārambham saparikkamanam, Pāt 14.10f.) means: by those bhikkhus,
|having checked that [the site] does not involve harm by reason of being
|devoid of the thirteen [dangers] consisting of the abodes, etc.,⁴ of ants,
|etc., and the sixteen dangers connected with grains and vegetables, etc.,⁵
|and that it has a space around it by reason of the ability for a cart yoked
|to two or four oxen⁶ to go around putting one wheel where the water
|falls from the eaves [of the roof]⁷ and one wheel outside, if they are

|^{k—k}Sp III 568,29f. ^{a—a}Sp III 568,30f.

| according to Kkh-pt (52,22f.) is nine *vidatthi** according to the “common
| *vidatthi*” (*pakati-vidatthi*), that is, about two metres.

|¹ This passage is the adjusted quotation from the Mahāpaccarī given at the end
| of the whole passage in Sp. The author of Kkh, who normally takes over only
| the last, authoritative opinion from Sp, in this case has taken up the content
| and has integrated it in the preceding sentence transmitted in Sp, see Sp III
| 568,14ff.: *Mahāpaccariyam pana “pacchimakoṭiyā catuhatthavitthārā vuttā,*
| *tato heṭṭhā akuṭi.”* “But in the Mahāpaccarī [it is stated]: ‘One that is at a
| minimum four cubits is called [a hut]; below that, it is not a hut.’” See also
| Kieffer-Pülz 2016a: 15.

|² For this passage there is a parallel in Sp III 568,11–16.

|³ See Vin III 149,31ff., BD I 254

|⁴ For these, see Vin III 151,6–12, BD I 256.

|⁵ For these, see Vin III 151,12–19, BD I 256f.

|⁶ For a comprehensive study on ancient Indian ox-carts in Vedic and epic literature, see Parpola 2018.

|⁷ *nibbodaka-patana-ṭṭhāne*, see Kieffer-Pülz 1992: B 7.2.2. The place where the
| water falls from the eaves marks the limitation of a house. Obviously, the
| space around the house must be the width of a cart measured from the outer
| limitation of the house.

148 *Bhikkhupātimokha: D. Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting* (68)

sufficient [to form a] Saṅgha, on that very spot, if [they are] not [sufficient], having gone amidst the Saṅgha, those [bhikkhus] asked by the bhikku must appoint the site by a procedure [with a decision as] the second [element] after [putting] the motion (*ñatti-dutiya-kamma**).

“*If on a site involving harm*” (*sārambhe ce*, Pāt 14.11), etc., is to be understood in the opposite way.

[This rule] was prescribed at Ālavi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the bhikkhus of Ālavi (= 2. *individuals*), with respect to the subject matter “building a hut by begging” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

[For a bhikkhu thinking,] “I will build a hut exceeding the [prescribed] measurements, with an unappointed site”, in each action from the time of going to the wilderness for the sake of materials onward [it is an offence of] wrong doing. [If he thinks] “Now I will finish it with two lumps”, [it is] a grave offence in the giving of the first lump of the [two]. By giving the second [lump] when the plaster has been joined, if it is only an unappointed site or only has exceeded the measurements, there is [one offence entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha and two [offences of] wrong doing. If there are both failings, there are two [offences entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha and two [offences of] wrong doing. ^bBut if not placing the door frame or the window he plasters [the wall] with clay, and when [door frame or window] are placed the plaster is not joined, this protects [from an offence] at first. But for one plastering again [it is an offence entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha as soon as [the plaster] is joined. If the placed [door frame or window] stand without a gap with the plaster which was given first, it is already [an offence entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha earlier¹. ^b^cOnly [if that is combined] with destruction of life [is there an offence of] wrong doing — similarly, if there is no open space around^c (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

^b—^bSp III 571,18–24 ^c—^c≠ Sp III 572,11f.

¹ *pathamam eva*. The commentaries explain that in that case the offence arises as soon as the plastering is completed, Kkh-nt 240,11ff; Sp-t II 335,17ff; Vmv I 277,14ff.

⟨69⟩*Saṅghādisesa 6 M*

149

There is no offence for one giving an unfinished hut to another,¹ and for one breaking the ground in making it level,² [and] for one causing to be made one or the other of an [artificial] mountain cave (*leṇa*), a cavern (*guhā*), a grass hut, and a house with a roof of leaves,³ and for one making a hut for another to dwell in, [or] for another purpose among observance (*uposatha*) house, etc. — except for a dwelling house [for oneself]⁴ — and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

It is a failure of virtuous conduct (= 8. *failure*). **⟨69⟩**

These are the six or seven constituent factors here: (i) there being one or other of plastered inside, etc., (ii) the existence of the lowest measurements,⁵ (iii) there being no appointed site, (iv) going beyond the prescribed measurement, (v) being destined to himself, (vi) being a dwelling house, and (vii) joining the plaster (= 9. *constituent factors*).

^d—[The offence against this rule has] six origins (= 10. [sorts of] origin).

[It originates in] activity and inactivity and inactivity. For one making it exceed the measurement, having indicated, “This is the site”, [the offence] arises from activity. For one making it without indicating the site, [the offence] arises from activity and inactivity (= 11. *activity*).^{—d}

The remainder⁶ here is exactly the same as stated in the [rule about] a go-between (Sgh 5 M).

The commentary on the rule about making a hut is finished.

^{d—d}Sp III 574,19ff.

¹ Not mentioned in the Vinaya, but see Sp III 572,19f.

² Not mentioned in the Vinaya, but see Sp III 572,20–27.

³ *tīna-kuti-panna-cchadana-geha*; this may also describe one type of house only. This is to be assumed because the *anāpatti* formula in the Vinaya only mentions the *tīna-kutikā*, and the commentaries only comment on *tīna-kuti* / *%kuṭikā*, see Sp III 573,14ff.; Kkh-nṭ 240,19f., and moreover, they mention its being roofed by grass or leaves.

⁴ Sp III 574,10f.: *vāsāgāram thapetvā sabbatthā ti* (Vin III 155,21f.) *attano vasanatthāya agāram thapetvā*. “Except for a dwelling house [there is no offence] in any of the circumstances means: except it be a house for his own dwelling.”

⁵ That is, four cubits (*hattha**) in width (Kkh-nṭ 240,23f.).

⁶ This refers to the remaining six categories (awareness, intention, faults, deeds, thoughts, and feelings).

150 *Bhikkhupātimokha: D. Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting* 〈69〉

[7. The commentary on the rule about building a dwelling place]

[7. Sgh M: *When a bhikkhu is having a large dwelling place made, with a [lay] owner [to build and give it, that is] intended for himself, bhikkhus are to be brought to appoint the site. By those bhikkhus a site not involving harm [to living creatures] is to be appointed with a space around it. If a bhikkhu should have a large dwelling place made on a site involving harm with no space around it, or if he should not bring bhikkhus to appoint the site, [this entails] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha.*

(Pāt 14,16–21 = Vin III 156,15–20)]

[42] In the seventh [rule] e—large (*mahallakan*, Pāt 14,16) means: [the dwelling place] is large insofar as it has a larger state than a begged hut because of the state of having an owner. Or since it is suitable to make it having appointed a site, even with an excess of measurement, therefore it is large also because of the largeness of its measurement — such a large [dwelling place]. But since its largeness of measurement is obtained only from the fact that it has an owner, therefore in order to show that meaning, it is said thus in the Word Analysis concerning it, “Large means it is called a dwelling place having an owner” (Vin III 156,21). Everything else is the same as was said in the rule about building a hut (Sgh 6 M), for the difference is only the mere state of having an owner.^e

The special features here are [the rule’s] being prescribed at Kosambi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Elder Channa (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “causing a [sacred] *cetiya* tree to be cut down” (= 3. *subject matter*), the fact that its origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*) is from mere inactivity (= 11. *activity*), and the fact that there is only one [offence entailing a] formal meeting of the Saṅgha.

The commentary on the rule about building
a dwelling place is finished.

[8. The commentary on the rule about being corrupted and corrupting]

[8. Sgh M: *Whatever bhikkhu should, being corrupted, corrupting, displeased, accuse a bhikkhu of an unfounded [offence entailing] defeat [thinking], “Perhaps I may make him fall from this holy life”, [and] then*

^e—eSp III 575,9–19

⟨70⟩

Saṅghādisesa 8 M

151

|on another occasion being questioned or not being questioned, that
|legal case turns out to be unfounded, and the bhikkhu admits to cor-
ruption, [this entails] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha.

(Pāt 14,24–16,3 = Vin III 163,21–26)] ⟨70⟩

In the eighth [rule]¹ f—corrupted, corrupting (*dūṭho doso*, Pāt 14,24) means: made corrupt and making corrupt (alternative forms). For when corruption has arisen an individual is made corrupt by that corruption, being caused to give up his normal state, therefore he is called corrupted. And he makes corrupt and destroys another, therefore he is called corrupting. So the words “corrupted” [and] “corrupting” show the variety of conditions of one and the same person.^{2–f}

g—Displeased (*appatīto*, Pāt 14,24) means: not pleased; the meaning is: bereft of, not approached by, joy and happiness, etc.^{–g}

Unfounded (*amūlakena*, Pāt 14,24f.) means: what, when an individual h—has been rebuked by a plaintiff, i—is unseen, unheard, unconsidered,^{–i} this is called unfounded because of the absence of those grounds which are called seeing, hearing, considering. Whether or not he has committed the offence is of no consequence here.^{–h} And here j—“unseen” (*adīṭhan*) means: not seen by one’s own eye of faith or the divine eye. “Unheard” (*asutam*) means: similarly not heard by anyone when it is being uttered. “Unconsidered”^{–j} (*aparisaṅkitam*) means: unconsidered in the mind by virtue of being seen, heard, thought about by oneself or another.

Thus, of an unfounded [offence entailing] defeat (*amūlakena pārājikena*, Pāt 14,24f.) of this sort means: of one or other of nineteen [offences] among those conforming to a bhikkhu,³ but in the Word Analysis, taking only those which have come down in the explanation of the [offences entailing] defeat, it is said j—“by one or other of four”^{–j}.

f—fSp III 584,16–20

g—gSp III 585,1f.

h—hSp III 585,15–18

i—iVin III 163,34

j—jSp III 585,19ff.

j’—j’Vin III 163,35

¹ For this rule, see von Hinüber 1999: 39.

² For a translation of this passage, see Pind 1989: 65.

³ These nineteen Pārājika offences are composed of eight Pārājika offences, four for monks and nuns, and four for nuns only; and the eleven unqualified individuals (*abhabba-puggala*), see above, pp. 57ff. See also von Hinüber 2000a: 67f. [2009: 252f.]

152 *Bhikkhupātimokha: D. Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting* 〈71〉

^k—Should accuse (*anuddhamseyya*, Pāt 14,25) means: should cause to fall (*dhamseyya*), should cause to crumble (*vidhamseyya*), should cause to perish (*padhamseyya*), should defeat (*abhibhaveyya*). But since he does that accusing (*anuddhamsana*) either rebuking by himself or causing another to rebuke, therefore it is said in the Word Analysis of this, “He rebukes or causes to rebuke” (*codeti vā codāpeti vā*, Vin III 163,36).^{-k} 〈71〉

There, four rebukes (*codanā*) are stated in brief: ^a—the demonstration of the subject matter [of the offence], the demonstration of the offence, the refusal of communion, the refusal of honour.^{-a}

Among these, ^b—“the demonstration of the subject matter” (Kkh 71,1) means: it is put forth in the following way, “You have indulged in sexual intercourse.”

“The demonstration of the offence” (Kkh 71,1) means: it is put forth in the following way, “You have committed the offence of sexual intercourse.”

“Refusal of communion” (Kkh 71,1) means: it is put forth thus, “There is no observance, no invitation ceremony, no procedure of the Saṅgha together with you.” To such an extent the matter does not come under [this] heading,¹ but it comes under [this] heading only when it is joined with such words as “You are not a [true] recluse”, etc.

“Refusal of honour” (Kkh 71,2) means: not standing up in greeting, or making a respectful salutation with cupped hands, or paying honour, or fanning, etc. This is to be understood of one doing honour, etc., successively, i.e. not doing it to one at the time of doing it to the remaining [members of the Saṅgha]. And to such an extent there is rebuking, but the offence [43] does not come under [this] heading. But when it is asked “Why do you not do me honour?”, etc., it comes under [this] heading only when it is joined with such words as “You are not a [true] recluse”.^{-b}

Therefore, whatever bhikkhu, standing in the vicinity of a bhikkhu, showing that meaning by such words as “You have indulged in sexual intercourse” or “You are not a [true] recluse” or only by a hand gesture,

^{k-k}Sp III 587,1-4 ^{a-a}Sp III 588,28f. ^{b-b}Sp III 588,29-89,10

¹ *sīsam na eti*; this means that it does not fulfil the criteria for an offence against this Saṅghādisesa rule.

⟨72⟩

Saṅghādisesa 8 M

153

either rebukes the bhikkhu himself, or causes one or other among householders or ascetics to rebuke [him], this means “one accuses” (*anuddhaṇseti*).

c—*Perhaps I may make him fall from this holy life* (*app eva nāma nam imamhā brahmacariyā cāveyyam*, Pāt 14,25f.) means: perhaps I may lead this individual away from this best life, that is to say, he should accuse with the [following] intention, “It would be good if I could cause this individual to fall away from this holy life.”—c

By this, having taken the one intention of making [him] fall, the remaining seven intentions are rejected: the intentions to abuse, [to hold] a procedure [with respect to an offence], to remove [the offence], to suspend the observance [of a single bhikkhu], to suspend the invitation ceremony [of a single bhikkhu], to examine, to recite the Doctrine.

Then on another occasion (*tato aparena samayena*, Pāt 14,26–16,1) means: at whichever time he is accused, at another time than that. ⟨72⟩

Or being questioned (*samanuggāhīyamāno vā*, Pāt 16,1) means: d—being examined, [i.e.] being investigated, by the examiner in the following way: “What was seen by you?”—d

Or not being questioned (*asamanuggāhīyamāno vā*, Pāt 16,1) means: not being spoken to because of any subject matter among [what was] seen, etc., or by any individual among examiners, etc. The [syntactical] connection of these words, [i.e. of “being questioned or not being questioned”] is with the [sentence given] afterwards, [i.e.]: *if the bhikkhu admits to corruption* (Pāt 16,2–3), e—for, the following is said [by this],¹ “Being thus questioned or not questioned, [...] if the bhikkhu admits to corruption, i.e. stands with reference to it, acknowledges it, [it is an offence entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha.”² And this is said to show the time of [making] manifest the unfounded state. But he commits the offence at the very moment of having accused [another bhikkhu].

That legal case turns out to be unfounded (*amūlakañ c’ eva tam*

¹c—c Sp III 592,33–93,4

²d—d Sp III 593,13ff.

³e—e Sp III 593,19–24

¹ *idam vuttam hoti* generally introduces the summarized meaning as given by the commentator. For its usage in Jātakas, see von Hinüber 1998a: 77.

² This sentence gives the meaning of the rule, omitting the words *amūlakañ c’ eva tam adhikaranam hoti* (marked by three dots in square brackets in the text above), and adding synonyms for *patitthāti*.

154 *Bhikkhupātimokha: D. Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting* 〈72〉

adhikarānam hoti, Pāt 16,2) means:^e here, however, [it is] “unfounded” because of the absence of grounds such as having seen it; [it is] “a legal case” because of the state of having to be ruled by the settlements (*samatha*). For, referring to, concerning, about, in connection with whatever settlements occur, that is a legal case. But here only the legal case about an offence (*āpattādhikarāna*) called [an offence entailing defeat] is intended. For, if that legal case is unfounded on the grounds of having seen, etc., this bhikkhu who has come to rebuke and who admits to corruption, [i.e.] stands with reference to it, acknowledges it, saying,^f “An empty thing was said by me”,^g etc., [there is an offence entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha for that bhikkhu at precisely the moment of having accused. This is the meaning of the rule in due course of the words.

[This rule] was prescribed at Rājagaha (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the bhikkhus following Mettiya and Bhummajaka (= 2. *individuals*), with respect to the subject matter “accusing of an unfounded [offence entailing] defeat” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

For one rebuking an ordained individual with [an offence entailing] defeat, whether pure or impure, knowing that he had not committed that [offence], because of the intention to make him fall [from the holy life], not having made [him give his] permission [by saying], “Let the venerable one give me permission; I want to speak about this [offence]” — if [the rebuked one] knows at that very moment, “He is rebuking me”, [there is an offence entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha in each utterance as well as [an offence of] wrong doing¹ [for the one rebuking]. For one rebuking, having made [him give his] permission, [it is only an offence entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha. Even for one rebuking face-to-face with a hand gesture it is exactly the same method. But for one rebuking in absentia (not face-to-face), the matter does not come under [this] heading. [44]

^{f–g}Vin III 164,11

¹ This is for not having obtained permission from the one who was rebuked, Vin III 166,11ff. (BD I 286).

⟨73⟩

Saṅghādisesa 8 M

155

Standing by himself in his presence, he orders another bhikkhu; that [bhikkhu] rebukes the [bhikkhu] in accordance with the statement of the [former bhikkhu], ⟨73⟩ offences [arise] in the stated manner only for the one who causes [the other] to rebuke. Or, if he (i.e. the second bhikkhu) also rebukes, [saying,] “It was seen, [or] heard by me”, similarly, there are offences for both these people. But for one speaking without having made [him give his] permission, because of the intention to insult, [there is both an offence of] expiation in the stated manner and [an offence of] wrong doing.

For one speaking, having made [him give his] permission, [it is] only [an offence of] expiation. For one carrying out the sevenfold procedures¹ in his absence, because of the intention of [carrying out] a procedure, [it is] only [an offence of] wrong doing. For one saying, because of the intention of the removal [of the offence], “You have committed such-and-such an offence; expiate it”, and for one suspending [his] observance or [his] invitation ceremony, there is no act [of giving] permission. But the sphere for postponing [the observance and the invitation ceremony] must be known.

^g—For one saying — because of the intention of examining when a subject matter has been laid before the examiner — “Is this yours?”, there is no act [of giving] permission. Also for a preacher of the doctrine preaching a general doctrine in the manner, “Whoever does this and that, he is not a [true] recluse”, there is no act [of giving] permission. But if explaining it specifically he says, “Such-and-such a person is not a [true] recluse, not a lay follower”, he must get down from the [Dhamma] seat and confess [his offence]² (= 6. [sorts of] offence). —^g

^g—^gSp III 597,27–98,2

¹ These are the different types of procedures (*tajjaniya*, *nissaya*, *pabbājanīya*, *patisāranīya*, and the three types of *ukkhepanīya*); cf. Nolot 1999: 2ff.

² Following Vmv the *dhamma-kathika* in explaining a *dhamma* specifically would have to have caused the accused to give his permission to speak about his offence. In not doing so, the *dhamma-kathika* has committed the offence of not having made the accused give permission. (Vmv I 293,16f.: *āpattim desetvā ti* (Sp III 598,2) *okāsākārāpanāpattim desetvā*. “**Confessing [his] offence** means: confessing [his] offence of not having made [him give his] permission.”) It is not clear, whether *gantabbam* qualifies the absolutives or whether it has to be translated as a separate verb. Since no further details are

156 *Bhikkhupātimokha: D. Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting* 〈73〉

And there is no offence for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

It is a failure of virtuous conduct (= 8. *failure*).

These are the five constituent factors here: (i) counting as ordained the one whom he rebukes or causes [another] to rebuke, (ii) thinking in respect of him that he [i.e. the rebuked one] is pure, (iii) the [offence entailing] defeat on account of which he rebukes him being unfounded, [unfounded] with regards to having seen, it, etc., (iv) rebuking face-to-face because of the intention of making him fall [from the holy life], (v) his knowledge at that moment (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., are the same as for the [rule about] taking what is not given (Pār 2 M),

but [the type of] feeling (= 17. *feelings*) here is only unpleasant (*dukkhā*).

The commentary on the rule about being corrupted and corrupting is finished.

[9. The commentary on the rule about belonging to another category]¹

[9. Sgh M: *Whatever bhikkhu should, being corrupted, corrupting, displeased, accuse a bhikkhu of [an offence entailing] defeat, taking merely as a pretext some point of a basis² belonging to another category*

given about what the *dhamma-kathika* has to do, it is most probably the former variant, which is the one translated above in the main text.

¹ In Sp III 602,²² this rule is named *dutiya-duṭṭha-dosa-sikkhāpada*, “the second rule of training [about] wicked, evil intention”, contrary to its name in Kkh *añña-bhāgiya-sikkhāpada*, “the rule about belonging to another category”.

² In Pāt 17,7f. this was translated as “taking merely as a pretext some point of a legal process connected with another class”. For that, Norman based himself on the common translation of the word *adhibarana* as “legal process” (here translated as “legal case”) which is supported by the Word Analysis (Vin III 168,10ff) where *adhibarana* is explained as “legal case” or “legal process”, referring to the four types of legal cases which have their basis in controversies (*yivāda*), censure (*anuvāda*), offences (*āpatti*) and legal duties (*kicca*). See Nolot 1996: 94. As has been shown by Schlingloff (1963: 540), the present rule was already misunderstood at an early time, which led to a strange introductory story and the attempt of the early commentators to explain *adhibarana* with the usual meaning it had at that time in legal texts. This, however, is not the meaning it has in the rule. The word *adhibarana* is used in differing meanings in the various chronological layers of this rule.

⟨74⟩

Saṅghādisesa 9 M

157

[thinking], “Perhaps I may make him fall from the holy life”, [and] then on another occasion being questioned or ⟨74⟩ not being questioned, that basis turns out to be belonging to another category, [and] some point has been taken merely as a pretext, and the bhikkhu admits to corruption, [this entails] a formal meeting of the saṅgha.

(Pāt 16,5–11 = Vin III 167,38–68,6)]

In the ninth [rule],¹ in respect of of [a basis] belonging to another category (*aññabhāgīyassa*, Pāt 16,5f.), etc.: “belonging to another category” means: h—“this is of another category” or “another category is his”.

Basis (adhikaraṇam) (Pāt 16,6) is to be understood as a base; that is,² as the foundation of the subject matter.³

For, in the arising of the matter⁴ (i.e. the introductory story) a male goat is said to be named Dabba Mallaputta. The venerable Dabba Mallaputta’s class, group, [and] faction, [are] human birth and being a bhikkhu. [This male goat] being an animal and being a male goat is of a class, group, [and] faction different from that of [the venerable Dabba Mallaputta]; or, he is of another category. Therefore he (i.e. the male goat) gets the name [of one] belonging to another category.

And since the base (*ādhāra*) for this idea of name giving, [i.e.] their saying, “Let us call him (i.e., the goat) Dabba Mallaputta”, is the foundation of the subject matter (*vatthu-adhiṭṭhānam*), therefore, [this base] is to be understood as the basis (*adhikaraṇa*). For with reference to this [basis] it was said [in the Vinaya], i—“Is it true, bhikkhus, that you [accused] Dabba Mallaputta [taking merely as a pretext some point] of a basis (*adhikaraṇa*) belonging to another category?”;^{5–i} not with reference to one or other among the legal cases [which have their basis in] controversies, etc. Why? Because [that] is impossible. For the followers

h–h Sp III 599,6–27 i–i Vin III 167,31f.

¹ For this rule, see von Hinüber 1999: 39.

² *ti vuttam hoti*, see above p. 122, n. 1.

³ Kkh 74,5f. *vatthu-adhiṭṭhānan*; the wrong variant *vatthu adhiṭṭhānam* (B^e) is not listed in Kkh.

⁴ *aṭṭhappatti/athuppatti** refers to the “provenance of the Pātimokkha rule” (*sikkhāpadassa nidāna*), that is, to the introductory story of Sgh 9 M (Kkh-nt 246,17ff.).

⁵ Since we filled in the lacuna, we omitted the *ādi* in the translation.

158 *Bhikkhupātimokha: D. Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting* 〈74〉

of Mettiya and Bhummajaka did not take up some point as a mere pretext of any legal case (*adhikarana*) belonging to another category among the four legal cases; nor does there exist a pretext of the four legal cases.¹ For the pretexts of birth, etc., are said to be the pretexts of individuals only, not of legal cases [which have their basis in] controversies, etc. And the name “Dabba Mallaputta” of the male goat — remaining in the state of a basis belonging to another category — [45] is some point [which is] merely a pretext to accuse the elder of an offence entailing defeat (*pārājika*).

And here “point” (*desa*)² means: is pointed, is indicated,³ is expressed [with the words,] “This is his”; it is a designation for one group or other among birth, etc.

“Pretext” (*lesa*) means another subject matter is moved to [someone],⁴ is connected to [someone],⁵ is attached to [someone] to some extent by means of mere expressions; it is a designation for one group or other among birth, etc.^{-h}

¹ The commentary stresses that “pretext” (*lesa*) does not exist for *adhikarana* when it has the sense “legal case”. Hence *adhikarana* cannot mean “legal case” in the introductory story and the Pātimokha rule. So also Sp III 599,18, where the commentator hints at the fact that the pretexts enumerated in Vin III 169,1ff. refer to individuals only, not to legal cases.

² *deso*. The ten elements indicated here by *jāti* are enumerated in the Vinaya as the ten pretexts (*lesa*, Vin III 169,1ff.). The other nine are *nāma*, *gotta*, *liṅga*, *āpatti*, *patta*, *cīvara*, *upajjhāya*, *ācariya*, and *senāsana* (name, family, characteristic, offence, a bowl, a robe, a preceptor, a teacher, a lodging).

³ An attempt to connect *desa* etymologically with *dissati* and *apadissati*.

⁴ *lissati*, in PED s.v. *lisati*. But see also MW s.v. *lís*; the verb appears almost exclusively in the present context. Similarly to the preceding explanation of *desa*, the author obviously attempts at connecting the noun with the verbal form. Cf. Vjb 200,24ff.: *tasmā theramp amūlakenā ti* (Sp III 599,25) *ādinā aññam pi vatthum therassa lissati silissati vohāramatten’ eva, na attatho, īsakam allīyatī ti lesō ti adhippāyo*. “Therefore, with [the words ‘in order to accuse] the elder of an unfounded [offence entailing defeat]’ a totally different subject matter is moved to, connected to the elder only by mere expression, not in substance; the intention is that ‘pretext’ means: it is attributed to [him] to a certain degree.” This explanation has partly also been transferred to Kkh-pt 55,13f.: *lissati silissati vohāramatten’ eva nathato. īsakam allīyatī ti lesō ti adhippāyo*.

⁵ MW s.v. *śliṣ* 2. adhere, cling to; join, connect.

⟨75⟩

Saṅghādisesa 9 M

159

j—But since that [point] — i.e. k—“[a bhikkhu] should accuse [a bhikkhu] of an offence entailing defeat taking as a pretext some point ⟨75⟩ of whatever basis belongs to another category”^{1–k} — has been made clear only by virtue of the arising of the matter (*atthuppatti**; i.e. in the introductory story), therefore,^{–j} it has not been dealt with in detail in the Word Analysis. ^a—Whatever four legal cases result from the homonymy of the word *adhikaraṇa* by virtue of the synopsis of the meaning,² whether they are of a different category or of the same category, since they are not clear but are to be understood by the experts in the Vinaya, [they have to be made clear]. Therefore,^{–a} in order to make them clear, and also to make clear the rebuke of [an offence of] another category of offences [mentioned] at the end [of the Vinaya section on the ninth offence entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha for monks],³ it is said in the Word Analysis [of the Vinaya] that ^b—*aññabhbāgīyassa adhikaraṇassā* (“of a legal case belonging to another category”) means: either it is [a legal case which has its basis in] another category of offences or [it is a legal case which has its basis in] other classes of legal cases,^{–b} etc.

The remainder of the [detailed] explanation is the same as that stated in the eighth [rule]. But the [following] is the difference: This [rule] (i.e. Sgh 9 M) was prescribed with respect to the subject matter “accusing of an unfounded offence entailing defeat taking merely as a pretext some point of a basis belonging to another category” (= 3. *subject matter*).

And here there is no offence because of rebuking [someone] about [a legal case belonging to] another category of offences, even for one thinking it is true (= 7. *non-offence*).

j–j Sp III 599,32–600,1

k–k Vin III 167,38–68,2

a–a Sp III 600,2–5

b–b Vin III 168,10f.

¹ Beginning of the Pātimokkha rule quoted in a shortened form.² For the “synopsis of the meaning” (*atthuddhāra*) as a means to remove contradictions, see Kieffer-Püllz 2013: I 236ff.³ For the addition we relied on the parallel in Sp III 600,8ff.: *yā ca sā avasāne āpattaññabhbāgīyassa adhikaraṇassā vasena codanā vuttā* (for a translation, see Kieffer-Püllz 2013: I 851ff., n. 12). Vjb 202,11–15, Vmv I 294,13–18, and Kkh-nṭ 248,25–29 explain that with this *codanā* mentioned at the end [of the Vinaya section on Sgh 9 M] the cases in the casuistry are meant (Vin III 170,9ff.).

160 *Bhikkhupātimokha: D. Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting* 〈76〉

And among the constituent factors, an additional [factor]¹ is “merely taking as a pretext some point whose basis belongs to another category” (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The commentary on the rule about belonging to another category is finished.

[10. The commentary on the rule about a split in the Saṅgha]²

[10. Sgh M: *Should any bhikkhu attempt to cause a split of a united Saṅgha or should he persist having undertaken and having taken up a legal case conducive to a split, that bhikkhu is to be spoken to by the bhikkhus thus, “Do not, venerable sir, attempt to cause a split in a united Saṅgha; do not persist having undertaken and having taken up a legal case conducive to a split. Let the venerable one be at peace with the Saṅgha; for the Saṅgha, united, in agreement, not disputing, having a single recitation [of the Pātimokha, etc.], lives comfortably.” And should that bhikkhu, being spoken to thus by the bhikkhus, persist in the same way [as before], that bhikkhu is to be admonished by the bhikkhus up to the third time to give up that [course of action]. If, being admonished up to the third time, he should give it up, that is good. If he should not give it up, [this entails] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha.*

(Pāt 16,14–25 = Vin III 172,31–73,4)]

In the tenth [rule], of a united Saṅgha (*samaggassa saṅghassa*, Pāt 16,14) means: of the Saṅgha of bhikkhus being associated; the meaning is: of [a Saṅgha] not separated by thought and body. That is why it is said in the Word Analysis of it: c—“United means: a Saṅgha belonging to the same communion, established within the same boundary”.^c 〈76〉 For [a Saṅgha] belonging to the same communion d—is not separated in thought because of the fact that [its members are of] the same thought. One established within the same boundary is not separated in body because of his giving physical unity (i.e. being physically present).

Should attempt to cause a split (bhedāya parakkameyya, Pāt 16,14) means: should make an effort for the sake of causing a split (*bhe-*

^c–^cVin III 173,7f. ^d–^dSp III 607,29–608,2

¹ This is to be added to the five constituent factors listed in Sgh 8 M.

² Sp III 611,10, has “The commentary on the first rule about a split in the Saṅgha”.

⟨76⟩

Saṅghādisesa 10 M

161

|*danatthāya*), [thinking,] “How may this [Saṅgha] be split (*bhijjeyya*)?”

|*Or a legal case conducive to a split (bhedanasamvattanikāṇ vā adhikaraṇā*, Pāt 16,15) means: an action conducive to splitting in order to split the Saṅgha, for in this place the legal case (*adhikaraṇa*) is intended as the cause, as in such phrases as “having sensual pleasures as its cause, sensual pleasures as its source, sensual pleasures as its basis”.^{1-d} That [cause] is eighteenfold by virtue of the subject matter which causes a split.

|*Having undertaken (samādāya*, Pāt 16,15f.) means: having taken.

|*Should he persist having taken up (paggayha tiṭṭheyya*, Pāt 16,16) means: should he — having taken up a cause capable of causing a split of the Saṅgha, conducive to the goal of splitting the Saṅgha — show it, and not give it up.

|*He is to be spoken to by the bhikkhus thus (bhikkhūhi evam assa vacanīyo*, Pāt 16,16f.) means: whoever sees him face-to-face, persisting, having taken up, or whoever hears that he is in such-and-such a dwelling, by them — even² having gone the distance of half a league (*yojana**) — phrases such as “Do not, sir” are uttered near [him]. Thus he is to be admonished. For those who, having seen or heard, say nothing, [it is an offence of] wrong doing. And here the word “do not” is to be constructed [46] with the word “attempt” and the word “persist”, i.e. “Do not attempt; do not persist.”

|*e—Let the venerable one be at peace with the Saṅgha (samet’ āyasmā saṅghena*, Pāt 16,19) means: let the venerable one be at peace with the Saṅgha; let him come together; the meaning is: let him have the same opinion. Why? “For the Saṅgha united … lives.”³

|*There, in agreement (sammodamāno*, Pāt 16,20) means: rejoicing well at each other’s success.

^{e—e}Sp III 608,23–30

¹ For instance M I 85,37–86,1; 92,24f.; etc.

² According to Kkh-nt 251,19f. *pi* after *gantvā* is put at the wrong place (*aṭṭhāna-ppayutta*) and should be connected to *adḍhayojanamattam*.

³ This is part of the Pātimokkha rule Sgh 10 M (Vin III 172,36ff.): *samaggo hi saṅgho sammodamāno avivādamāno ekuddeso phāsu viharatī ti*. “For the Saṅgha, united in agreement, not disputing, having a single recitation [of the Pātimokkha, etc.], lives comfortably.”

162 *Bhikkhupātimokha: D. Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting* 〈77〉

Not disputing (*avivadamāno*, Pāt 16,20) means: not disputing (alternative formation), saying, “This is the Dhamma, this is not the Dhamma”.

Having a single recitation (*ekuddeso*, Pāt 16,20) means: there is one recitation of it. The meaning is: there is one recitation of the Pātimokha that was produced together. 〈77〉

He lives comfortably (*phāsu viharati*, Pāt 16,20) means: he lives happily.^e Thus for him, [after] being spoken to three times, both separately and in the midst of the Saṅgha, [it is an offence of] wrong doing if he does not give up.

In [the phrase] beginning with, *And that [bhikkhu ... being spoken to] thus* (*evañ ca so*, Pāt 16,21), [the word] is to be admonished (*samanubhāsitabbo*, Pāt 16,22f.) means: the procedure of admonishment is to be carried out.¹

^f-*This then is good* (*icc' etam kusalam*, Pāt 16,24) means: thus this relinquishment is good, gives ease, is well-being for that bhikkhu.^f

If he should not give it up, [this is an offence] entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha (*no ce patinissajjeyya, sañghādiseso*, Pāt 16,24-25) means: herein there is an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha for him if he does not give it up at the end of the procedure of admonishment. The remainder of the meaning of the words is clear.

[This rule] was prescribed at Rājagaha (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Devadatta (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter of an attempt to cause a split in the Saṅgha (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

For one who does not relinquish when the procedure of admonishment is being carried out, [there is] an offence of wrong doing at the completion of the motion. With the [first] two subsequent proclamations² [there are] two grave offences.¹ With the third proclamation —

^{f-f}Sp III 608,30ff.

¹ This procedure (*kamma**) is described in Vin III 173,30ff.

² *kamma-vācā** here is used for *anussāvanā*, “proclamation”, not for the complete formula consisting of motion (*ñatti*), proclamation (*anussāvanā* or *kamma-vācā*), and resolution.

ending with the syllable *ya* in the following way: “To whom this is not acceptable, he should speak (*bhāseyya*)² — the offence of wrong doing and the [two] grave offences are revoked. Only the offence entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha remains (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one who relinquishes without being admonished, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

[The offence against this rule] is a failure of virtuous conduct (*sīla-vipatti*) (= 8. *failure*).

These are the four constituent factors (*aṅga*) here: (i) the attempt to cause a split, (ii) the admonishment by a proper procedure, (iii) the end of the [third] proclamation, (iv) the non-relinquishing (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The [offence against this rule has the] origin of [the rule] about admonishment (= 10. [sorts of] origin),³

[it originates in] inactivity (= 11. *activity*),

[has] acquittal because of [lacking] awareness (= 12. *awareness*),

[is dependent on] intention (= 13. *intention*),

[is] a fault according to common opinion (= 14. *fault*),

[is] a physical deed, a verbal deed (= 15. *deeds*),

[is done with] an unwholesome [type of] thought (= 16. *thought*),

[with an] unpleasant feeling (= 17. *feeling*).

The commentary on the rule about a split in the Saṅgha is finished.

[11. The commentary on the rule about followers of [one creating] a split]

[11. Sgh M: *[It may be that] there are bhikkhus who are followers of that same bhikkhu, proponents of [his] faction, one or two or three. They may say thus, “Do not, venerable sirs, ⟨78⟩ say anything to that bhikkhu; that bhikkhu is a speaker of Dhamma, and that bhikkhu is a*

¹ With the third and final proclamation the person becomes guilty of an offence entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha.

² This is the final sentence of each proclamation, see for instance Vin III 174.4.

³ Actually, this is the present rule, which in fact is the first rule having this origin (*saṃutthāna*); it has only one origin, namely from body, speech, and thought (rendered as “mind” by von Hinüber); for more details, see von Hinüber 1992a: 61.

164 *Bhikkhupātimokkha: D. Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting* 〈78〉

speaker of Vinaya, and that bhikkhu speaks in accordance with our desire and choice, he knows us and speaks [with us], and that suits us indeed.” Those bhikkhus are to be spoken to by the bhikkhus thus, “Do not, venerable sirs, speak thus; for that bhikkhu is neither a speaker of Dhamma nor a speaker of Vinaya. May a split in the Saṅgha not seem good to the venerable ones too. Let the venerable ones’ [thoughts] be at peace with the Saṅgha; for the Saṅgha, united, in agreement, not disputing, having a single recitation [of the Pātimokka, etc.], lives comfortably.” And should those bhikkhus, being spoken to thus by the bhikkhus, persist in the same way [as before], those bhikkhus are to be admonished by the bhikkhus up to the third time for giving up that [course of action]. If, being admonished up to the third time, they should give it up, that is good. If they should not give it up, [this entails] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha.

(Pāt 18,1–16 = Vin III 175,14–28)]

In the eleventh [rule] *Of that same (tass’ eva kho pana, Pāt 18,2)* means: whoever attempts to cause a split of the Saṅgha, of him.

g—*Followers (anuvattakā, Pāt 18,2)* means: following [his] practice by adopting his view, preference, choice.

Proponents of [his] faction (vaggavādakā, Pāt 18,3) means: they speak for his faction, an utterance associated with non-reconciliation.^{—g}
h—But since [there are] not more than three that deserve a procedure — because a Saṅgha does not carry out a procedure against a Saṅgha¹ — therefore *one or two or three (eko vā dve vā tayo vā, Pāt 18,3)* is said.

He knows us (jānāti no, Pāt 18,6) means: he knows our wishes, etc.

He speaks (bhāsati, Pāt 18,7) means: he speaks with us [saying], “Let us act thus”.

That pleases us indeed (amhākaṇ p’ etām khamati, Pāt 18,7) means: what he does, this is indeed pleasing to us.

Let the venerable ones’ [thoughts] be at peace with the Saṅgha

^{g—g}Sp III 611,12ff. ^{h—h}Sp III 611,18–24

¹ This sentence is given as a reason (*hi*) for the preceding statement, according to which not more than three individuals deserve a procedure. This takes up the description of the admonishment in the Vinaya. There, the formula used for an admonition clearly is intended for an individual, not for a Saṅgha (consisting of at least four individuals). From this it follows that here, three individuals at most were at work.

⟨79⟩*Saṅghādisesa 12 M*

165

(samet' āyasmantānam saṅghena, Pāt 18,10f.) means: let the thought of the venerable ones be at peace with, agree with the Saṅgha; that is to say, let it obtain unity.^h

As to the meaning of the words, the remainder is absolutely clear. Even the [detailed] regulation here is just the same as that stated in the tenth [rule]. But the [following] is the difference:

*[This rule] was prescribed at Rājagaha (= 1. *provenance*) concerning many monks [47] (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter of their following Devadatta when he was attempting to cause a split in the Saṅgha (= 3. *subject matter*).*

And as “attempt”¹ [is seen] there (i.e. in Sgh 10 M) among the constituent factors, so ⟨79⟩ “following [someone]” is to be seen here (i.e. in Sgh 11 M) [among the constituent factors].

The commentary on the rule about followers
of [one creating] a split is finished.

[12. The commentary on the rule about being difficult to speak to]

[12. Sgh M: *[It may be that] a bhikkhu is naturally difficult to speak to, and when spoken to legitimately by bhikkhus in respect of the rules of training included in the recitation, he makes himself unadmonishable [saying], “Do not, venerable sirs, say anything at all to me either good or bad, and I too shall not say anything at all to the venerable ones either good or bad. Refrain, venerable sirs, from speaking to me.” That bhikkhu is to be spoken to by the bhikkhus thus, “Venerable sir, do not make yourself unadmonishable, rather let the venerable one make himself admonishable. Let the venerable one speak legitimately to the bhikkhus, and the bhikkhus will speak legitimately to the venerable one; for the Blessed One’s assembly has come to growth thus, that is to say by speaking to one another and by mutually removing [offences].”*

And should that bhikkhu, being spoken to thus by the bhikkhus, persist in the same way [as before], that bhikkhu is to be admonished by the bhikkhus up to the third time for giving up that [course of action]. If, being admonished up to the third time, he should give it up, that is good. If he should not give it up, [this entails] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha.

(Pāt 18,19–20,6 = Vin III 178,3–18)]

¹ In Sgh 10 M the attempt to split the Saṅgha is the first of the four constituent factors (*aṅga*). In Sgh 11 M “siding with” replaces it.

166 *Bhikkhupātimokha: D. Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting* (80)

In the twelfth [rule] ⁱnaturally difficult to speak to (*dubbacajātiko*, Pāt 18,19) means: being difficult to talk to by nature. The meaning is: he is impossible to talk to.⁻ⁱ

^jIn respect of [the rules] included in the recitation (*uddesapariyāpannesu*, Pāt 18,19f.) means: in respect of [the rules] included, contained in the recitation. The meaning is: in respect of [the rules] occurring inside the Pātimokha because of being included in the [following] way, “For whom there may be an offence, he should reveal it.”

When spoken to legitimately [by bhikkhus]¹ (*sahadhammikam vuca-māno*, Pāt 18,20f.) means: when spoken to lawfully (or: by a co-religionist, *sahadhammikena*).² And this is the accusative case used in the sense of the instrumental. The meaning is: being spoken to in accordance with the rule prescribed by the Buddha that has obtained the name “legitimate(ly)”³ (Pāc 71 M) either because it is to be learned by the five co-religionists or because of being their property.

Refrain, venerable ones, from speaking to me (*viramathe ayasmanto mama vacanāya*, Pāt 18,23f.) means: whatever speech you speak to me, refrain from that speech with respect to me, that is to say, do not speak that speech to me. (80)

Let him speak in accordance with the rule (*vadetu sahadhammena*, Pāt 18,27) means: let him speak in accordance with a lawful rule, or even with any other lawful utterance conducive to a pleasant disposition.

ⁱ-iSp III 612,20f. ^j-jSp III 613,6-22

¹ Our translation differs from what the commentator understood the passage to mean.

² The word *saha-dhammika* is used as a noun meaning a follower of the same doctrine and comprised of five groups (bhikkhus, bhikkhunīs, male novices, female novices, women trainees), and as an adjective or adverb meaning legitimate(ly), reasonable (reasonably), literally, “in accordance with the rule”. See CDB I 747, n. 72. In the present case, the commentator explains the adverb *saha-dhammikan* of the commented text by the substantive.

³ *sahadhammika-sikkhāpada*; following the preceding explanation of the commentator, *saha-dhammika* in that rule’s name could be either understood as the adjective “legitimate” or the adverb “legitimately” (lit. “in accordance with the rule”), or as the noun “co-religionist”. From the point of view of content, the first variant is the more probable, since despite the commentator’s explanations above, in the rule under discussion (Pāc 71 M) *saha-dhammikan* is used as an adverb.

⟨80⟩*Saṅghādisesa 13 M*

167

| That is to say (*yad idam*, Pāt 20,1): [this is] a particle for showing
| the cause of the growth [of the Blessed One's assembly]. Therefore, what-
| ever speech [is] beneficial to one another and the removal of whatever
| offence, by that speaking to one another [and] by that mutual removal
| [of offences].¹

| For the Blessed One's assembly has come to growth thus (*evam*
| *saṃvaddhā hi tassa Bhagavato parisā*, Pāt 18,28) means: thus the cause
| of the growth of the assembly is shown.

| The remainder [of the words] are absolutely clear in meaning.² Even
| the explanation of the regulation is exactly the same as that stated in the
| tenth [rule]. But the [following] is the difference:

| [This rule] was prescribed at Kosambi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning
| Elder Channa (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter of
| making himself inaccessible to admonitions (= 3. *subject matter*).

| And as “attempt”² [is seen] there (i.e. in Sgh 10 M) among the con-
| stituent factors, so “the state of making himself one inaccessible to
| admonitions” is to be seen here (i.e. in Sgh 12 M) [among the
| constituent factors].

| The commentary on the rule about being difficult to speak to is finished.

| [13. The rule about a corrupter of families]

| [13. Sgh M: *[It may be that] a bhikkhu [who is] a corrupter of families*
| *and of bad behaviour lives in dependence on some village or market*
| *town, [and that] his bad behaviour is seen and heard about, and*
| *families corrupted by him are seen and heard about. That bhikkhu is to*
| *be spoken to by the bhikkhus thus, “The venerable one is a corrupter of*
| *families [and] of bad behaviour. The venerable one’s bad behaviour is*
| *seen and heard about, and families corrupted by the venerable one are*
| *seen and heard about. Let the venerable one depart from this abode.*
| *You have lived here long enough.” And should that bhikkhu, being*
| *spoken to thus by the bhikkhus, say to those bhikkhus, “The bhikkhus*
| *are going [wrong] from desire and going [wrong] from hatred and*
| *going [wrong] from stupidity and going [wrong] from fear. Because of*
| *the same offence they banish one and do not banish another”, that*

¹ For a slightly more detailed parallel, see Sp III 613,18–22.

² See above, p. 165, n. 1.

168 *Bhikkhupātimokkha: D. Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting* 〈81〉

bhikkhu is to be spoken to by the bhikkhus thus, “Do not, venerable sir, speak thus. The bhikkhus are not going [wrong] from desire nor going [wrong] from hatred nor going [wrong] from stupidity nor going [wrong] from fear. The venerable one is a corrupter of families [and] of bad behaviour. The venerable one’s bad behaviour is seen and heard about, and families corrupted by the venerable one are seen and heard about. Let the venerable one depart from this abode. You have lived here long enough.” And should that bhikkhu being spoken to thus by the bhikkhus, 〈81〉 persist in the same way [as before], that bhikkhu is to be admonished by the bhikkhus up to the third time for giving up that [course of action]. If, being admonished up to the third time, he should give it up, that is good; if he should not give it up, [this entails] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha.

(Pāt 20,8–31 = Vin III 184,9–32)]

In the thirteenth [rule], *village or market town* (*gāmaṇ vā nigamam vā*, Pāt 20,8) means: here even a city (*nagara*) is included in [the term] village.

Lives in dependence (*upanissāya viharati*, Pāt 20,9) means: he dwells depending on that [village or market town] because of the presence of requisites such as robes which are associated with it.

^k–*Corrupter of families* (*kuladūsako*, Pāt 20,9) means: he corrupts families, ^k destroying the faith of men by gifts of flowers, etc.

^a–*Of bad behaviour* (*pāpasamācāro*, Pāt 20,9) means: his ways of behaviour^a consisting in planting flowering trees, etc., ^a–are bad.^a

That bhikkhu (*so bhikkhu*, Pāt 20,11) means: that bhikkhu who is a corrupter of families.

The venerable one is a corrupter of families ... You have lived here long enough (*āyasmā kho kuladūsako ... pe ... alan te idhavāsenā*, Pāt 20,12–15): with this [sentence the Vinaya] shows the [bhikkhu’s] state of deserving the procedure of banishment. But when the procedure of banishment has been carried out against [this bhikkhu], in whatever village or market town the family corrupting act was done and whichever *vihāra*¹ this one lives in, he is not allowed to wander in that village

^k–^kSp III 626,4f. ^a–^aSp III 629,3f.

¹ *vihāra* can refer to a hut, a monastery, or various buildings in the monastery, so it is left untranslated here.

⟨81⟩

Saṅghādisesa 13 M

169

nor market town nor to live in that vihāra.

And thus that bhikkhu (evañ ca so bhikkhu, Pāt 20,16) means: here “that” (so) is intended as the one against whom a procedure of banishment has been carried out.

^b-[*The bhikkhus are] going [wrong] from desire (chandagāmino, Pāt 20,17)* means: they go according to [their] desire.^{-b} This method [also applies] to the remaining [words].

That bhikkhu (so bhikkhu, Pāt 20,16) means: the one speaking [the words] “going [wrong] from desire” (Pāt 20,17), etc. [48] He is to be spoken to thus for the rejection of this utterance, not for avoiding the corruption of families. Because for the one who has already previously committed offences that can be committed by the act of corrupting families,¹ there is another [offence of] wrong doing because of not relinquishing when spoken to in that way separately or amidst the Saṅgha.²

Everything spoken before this [phrase], *And thus he (evañ ca so, Pāt 20,16)*, etc., or not spoken [before this] is absolutely clear in meaning. Even the [detailed] regulation is just the same as that stated in the tenth [rule] (i.e. Sgh 10 M). But the [following] is the difference:

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the bhikkhus who are followers of Asajī and Punabbasu (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter of doing evil by being guided by desire, etc. (= 3. *subject matter*).

^b-^bSp III 629,10

¹ According to Kkh-nt 256,22ff. this refers to offences that may be committed with the aim of corrupting families. This comprises an offence of wrong doing (*dukkata*) for giving flowers bought from one's own money, a grave offence (*thullaccaya*) if the gift intended for the family is paid from the Saṅgha's property with arrogated power of disposal, or even an offence entailing defeat (*pārājika*) if one applies force.

² As stated in the Vinaya, a monk banished because of corrupting families who persists in his wrong behaviour and brings other monks to fall into wrong courses should be admonished, and if he does not relinquish, he commits an offence of wrong doing (*dukkata*) with the motion (*ñatti*), grave offences (*thullaccaya*) with the proclamations (*anussavānā*), etc. (Vin III 185,18ff.).

170 *Bhikkhupātimokha: D. Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting* (82)

And (82) as “attempt”¹ [is seen] there (i.e. in Sgh 10 M) among the constituent factors, so “doing evil by desire, etc.”, is to be seen here (i.e. in Sgh 13 M) [among the constituent factors].

The rule about the corrupter of families is finished.

[The commentary on the Saṅghādisesa conclusion]

[Recited, venerable sirs, are the thirteen rules entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha, nine with offences at once and four [with offences] up to the third [unheeded admonition]. If a bhikkhu has committed [an offence against] one or other of these [rules], he must live on probation with no choice in the matter for as many days as he knowingly concealed [the offence]. When the bhikkhu has finished the probation he must undertake in addition the six-night mānatta penance for bhikkhus. When the bhikkhu has completed the penance he must be reinstated where there may be a Saṅgha of bhikkhus comprising a chapter of twenty. If a Saṅgha of bhikkhus comprising a chapter of even one less than twenty should reinstate that bhikkhu, then that bhikkhu is not reinstated and those bhikkhus are censurable. This is the proper course here.]

There I ask the venerable ones, “Are you pure in this?” A second time I ask, “Are you pure in this?” A third time I ask, “Are you pure in this?” The venerable ones are pure in this, therefore they are silent. Thus I record it.

(Pāt 22,1–15)]

c—Recited are [the thirteen rules] ... So I record it (*uddiṭṭhā kho ... pe ... evam etam dhārayāmi*, Pāt 22,1–14): herein with offences at once (*pathamāpattikā*, Pāt 22,2) means: of those [rules with] an offence at once. The meaning is: [the offence] is committed² at once at the very moment of transgression. But as to the other [rules], just as [something that] occurs on the third and the fourth day is called “third” [and] “fourth” here, so [too these other rules] are to be known as [rules with offences] up to the third [unheeded admonition] (*yāvatatiyakā*, Pāt 22,2)

c—cSp III 629,18–24

¹ See above, p. 165, n. 1.

² The text reads “is to be committed” (*āpajjitabbā*).

⟨83⟩*Saṅghādisesa Conclusion*

171

insofar as they occur when the procedure of admonition [proceeded] up to the third [unheeded admonition].

As many days (*yāvatīham*, Pāt 22,3) means: as many days (resolution of compound).

Knowingly conceals (*jānam paṭicchādeti*, Pāt 22,3f) means: knowingly (alternative form) conceals.^c ^dHere, this is the index [list] of the characteristic of concealing:¹

- (i) There is an offence,
- (ii) and he thinks that it is an offence.
- (iii) He is of good standing,
- (iv) and he thinks that he is of good standing.
- (v) He is without obstacle,
- (vi) and he thinks that he is without obstacle.
- (vii) He is able,
- (viii) and he thinks that he is able.
- (ix) He is desirous of concealing,
- (x) and he conceals.

There, (i–ii) “there is an offence, and he thinks that it is an offence” (Kkh 82,25) means: whatever offence he has committed, that is one or other of the thirteen [offences entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha]. And there^d even [if] he has given up the responsibility either by virtue of the subject matter, [i.e.] “This is not suitable for bhikkhus”, or by virtue of the mere name, “This [is] the offence having such-and-such a name”, ⟨83⟩ indeed, thinking that it is an offence, indeed, desirous of concealing it thus, “I will not now tell it to anyone”, [and if he then] lets the sun rise, the offence is concealed. But if he thinks here that it is not an offence, or if he thinks it [belongs to] another group of offences [other than the offences entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha], or if he is in doubt, [the offence] is indeed not concealed.

(iii) “He is of good standing” (*pakatatto*, Kkh 82,25) means: he is not suspended, belongs to the same communion. ^eIf he conceals [his

^{d–d}Sp VI 1174.1–6 ^{e–e}Sp VI 1174.15f.

¹ This is to be known in order to be able to decide whether or not a monk has concealed an offence, and if yes, for how long.

172 *Bhikkhupātimokha: D. Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting* (83)

offence] in the stated way thinking that he is of good standing, it is concealed.^e

(v) ^f“He is without obstacle” (*anantarāyiko*, Kkh 82,26) means: for whom there is not even one among the ten obstacles, [namely] king, thief, fire, water, human, non-human, wild animal, snake, obstacle to life, obstacle to chastity. If he conceals [his offence] thinking that he is without obstacle, it is concealed.^f

(vii) ^g“He is able” (*pahu*, Kkh 82,27) means: whoever is able to go to a bhikkhu and announce [his offence]. If he, thinking that he is able to, conceals [his offence], it is concealed.^g

(ix–x) ^h*He is desirous of concealing, and he conceals (chādetu-kāmo ca hoti, chādeti ca*, Kkh 82,27): This is absolutely clear.^h ⁱFor even if he, seeing [someone] of the same group [thinking,] “This is my preceptor or teacher”, because of shame does not announce [his offence], it is indeed concealed, because here, being the preceptor, etc., is of no consequence; only the mere [consisting of the] same group (*sabhāga*) is of consequence.ⁱ This is the brief explanation of the meaning of the phrase *knowingly conceals* (Pāt 22,3f.). [49]

So many days (*tāvatihām*, Pāt 22,4) means: so many days (resolution of compound); the meaning is: so long a time as the time that has elapsed — by virtue of days, fortnights, months, or years — from the day of concealing [the offence] up to the day of announcing [it].

^j*He must live on probation with no choice [in the matter]* (*akāmā parivatthabbañ*, Pāt 22,4f.) means: not by choice, not by wish, but without choice, against his wish, he must dwell having taken up probation.^j There ^kare three^l sorts of probation: (1) probation for concealing, (2) purifying probation, and (3) combining probation.

There, (1) the probation for concealing is to be given for as long as the offence was concealed. Because for some [individual] the offence is concealed for one day; for some [other] individual [it is] concealed for two days, etc.; for some [individual] there is one offence; for some

^{f–f}Sp VI 1174,25ff. ^{g–g}Sp VI 1175,5ff. ^{h–h}Sp VI 1175,14f. ^{i–i}Sp VI 1175,25–28
^{j–j}Sp III 629,26ff. ^{k–k}Sp VI 1173,25–31

^l Sp 1159,23ff. mentions four types, adding *a-paṭicchanna-parivāsa*, which is the probationary period given to heretics who want ordination in the Buddhist community.

⟨84⟩

Saṅghādisesa Conclusion

173

[other] individual there are two or three [offences] or more than that.^{-k}

^aTherefore, probation is to be given by the one giving the probation for concealing; first of all in the stated way, [by] knowing the fact that it was concealed; then [by] considering the days it was concealed and the offences; ⟨84⟩ if one [offence] was concealed for one day, then [by] causing probation to be asked for thus, ^b“I, sir, have committed one offence, the intentional emission of semen, concealed for one day”;^{-b} [and finally by] reciting the formula for the procedure according to the method handed down in the Khandhaka.¹

Or, if [an offence] was concealed for two or three days, etc., then the construing [of the sentence in the formula for the procedure (*kamma-vācā*)] is to be effected by virtue of days up to fourteen days, thus, [i.e. by inserting] “concealed for two days, concealed for three days, concealed for four days, concealed for five days” ... up to ... “concealed for fourteen days”.² If [an offence] was concealed for fifteen days, the construing [of the sentence in the formula for the procedure (*kamma-vācā*)] is to be effected [by inserting] “concealed for a fortnight”. From there up to the twenty-ninth day, for that long, [the construing of the sentence in the formula for the procedure (*kamma-vācā*)] is to be effected by inserting] “concealed for more than a fortnight”. Furthermore, the construing [of the sentence in the formula for the procedure (*kamma-vācā*)] is to be effected [by inserting] “concealed for a month, concealed for more than a month, concealed for two months, concealed for more than two months, concealed for three months” ... up to ... “concealed for more than eleven months”. When a full year [has passed, the construing of the sentence in the formula for the procedure (*kamma-vācā*)] is to be effected [by inserting] “concealed for one year”, beyond that [by inserting] “for more than one year, two years”, ... thus up to ... “concealed for sixty years, concealed for more than sixty years”, or the construing [of the sentence in the formula for the procedure (*kamma-vācā*)] is to be effected saying even more than that.^{-a}

^{a-a}Sp VI 1176,16-77 ^{b-b} Vin II 38,16f.

¹ Cf. Vin II 38,23-39,14.

² *kamma-vācās** for this purpose mostly contain an enumeration of the possible words to be inserted. Pālim 335,4ff. contains a large number of *kamma-vācās* concerning the confession of Saṅghādisesa offences.

174 *Bhikkhupātimokha: D. Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting* (85)

^c—But if there are two or three offences or more than that, just as “one offence” is said, in the same way “two offences, three offences” is to be said. But more than that, whether it be a hundred or a thousand, it is suitable to say “many”.

In respect of a variety of subject matters too, the construing [of the sentence in the formula for the procedure (*kamma-vācā*)] is to be effected by virtue of the number, as follows: “I, sir, have committed many offences entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha concealed for one day, one [offence of] emission of semen (Sgh 1 M), one [offence of] bodily contact (Sgh 2 M), one [offence of] lewd words (Sgh 3 M), one [offence of] sensual pleasure (Sgh 4 M), one [offence of] acting as a go-between” (Sgh 5 M); or by virtue of announcing the subject matter, as follows: “I, sir, have committed many offences entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha with a variety of subject matter, concealed for one day”; or by virtue of the mere name [of the class of the offences, with the words,] “I, sir, have committed many offences entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha, concealed for one day.” (85)

There the name is twofold: (i) one common to its own class and (ii) one common to all. There (i) “[offence] entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha” is common to its own class. (ii) “Offence” is common to all (generic name).

Therefore, it is suitable to say [it] even by virtue of the name common to all in that way, “I have committed many offences concealed for one day.” [50] For it is in fact suitable to carry out a legal Vinaya procedure such as probation

- (i) by virtue of the subject matter,
- (ii) by virtue of the group,
- (iii) by virtue of the name, and
- (iv) by virtue of the offence.

(i–ii) There, “emission of semen” is subject matter and group.
 (iii–iv) “[Offence] entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha” is name and offence.

There (i–ii) by a phrase [such as], “emission of semen”, “bodily contact”, etc., as well as by a phrase [such as] “with a variety of subject matter”, subject matter and group are included;

(iii–iv) by the word “[Offence] entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha”, as well as by the word “offences”, name and offence are included.^{4c} Therefore the formula for the procedure (*kamma-vācā*) can be made by virtue of one or other among these [phrases].

And at the end of the procedure, if the residence has few bhikkhus, it is possible [for him] to stay there without committing an interruption [of the probationary period] as to nights;¹ there indeed the [probationary] observance² should be taken up [saying] three times, “I take up probation, I take up the [probationary] observance.” Having taken [it] up, having announced [it to] the Saṅgha, by his announcing [it] to the various newly in-coming bhikkhus,³ the probation must be served right there, without committing an interruption of the [probationary] observance and without committing an interruption as to nights.

If it is not possible to carry through⁴ the probation, if he wants to dwell with the [probationary] observance suspended,⁵ the probation is to be suspended [by him] right there amidst the Saṅgha, or in the presence of one individual [with the words] “I suspend the probation, I suspend

¹ *ratti-ccheda* lit. “interruption as to nights”, is the term for an interruption of the probationary period. There are three types of *ratticcheda* with respect to the probationary period: (1) dwelling together with (*sahavāsa*) a single bhikkhu of good standing under one roof; (2) dwelling away, separated from (*vippavāsa*), that is, living alone; and (3) not announcing (*anārocana*) his state of being under probation to incoming monks (Vin II 33.37–34.2; Sp VI 1169,21–24). That a residence has a low number of bhikkhus (probably less than four since they cannot form a Saṅgha) is explicitly explained to not fulfil the interruption of the probationary period (*ratti-ccheda*). Thus a bhikkhu under probation may not live alone in a residence, may also not live together under one roof with only one bhikkhu of good standing, but obviously does not need to live together with a Saṅgha.

² *vatta*, “observance”, is used with respect to various types of observances (for instance, the observances during the *mānatta* penance, observances vis-à-vis a preceptor or a teacher). In order to specify the observance for the probationary period from the others we render it by “[probationary] observance”. The Vinaya lists ninety-four observances a bhikkhu under probation has to observe (Vin II 31,28–33,32).

³ It belongs to the observances of a monk under probation to announce his status of being under probation to each incoming monk (Vin II 32,19f.).

⁴ *sodhetum*, lit. to purify, cleanse, etc. Cf. IBH, BD V 49, n. 3.

⁵ *nikkhitta*; in such cases the observance is interrupted temporarily, see Vin II 34,3–20.

176 *Bhikkhupātimokha: D. Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting* (86)

the [probationary] observance". And even with one phrase [of the two] here, the probation is suspended. But with both the probation is well suspended indeed. With respect to taking up [the probation and the probationary observance], too, exactly this is the method. From the time of suspending [it], he is in the state of good standing.¹

Then at dawn, having passed together with one [other] bhikkhu, ^dbeyond two stone throws from the enclosure of an enclosed *vihāra* [or two stone throws] from the place suitable for an enclosure of an unenclosed *vihāra*, having branched off from the main road, having sat down in a place concealed by a hedge or a fence, having taking up the [probationary] observance actually before dawn, it is to be announced by him.^{-d} Whatever other bhikkhu he sees, to him, too, it is to be announced indeed.

If the sun has risen, he must suspend the [probationary] observance in this [bhikkhu's] presence [and] go to the *vihāra*. If he went for any purpose before sunrise, having gone to the *vihāra*, ^ewhichever bhikkhu he sees first of all, having announced [it] to him, [the probationary observance] is to be suspended.^{-e} (86) Thus, having considered [the period], for that length of time he has to live under probation until the nights (i.e. days) are completed. This briefly is the regulation of the "probation for concealing". But the detailed [version] is to be understood exactly in the manner stated in the *Samantapāśadikā*, the commentary on the *Vinaya*.²

Among the other two [probations], (2) the one called "purifying probation" (*suddhantaparivasa*) was allowed in the *Khandhaka* in respect of the subject matter: ^f"he does not know the definite number of offences; he does not know the definite number of nights".^{-f} It is twofold:

- (2.1) minor purifying (*culla-suddhanta*) and
- (2.2) major purifying (*maha-suddhanta*).

And this two-fold probation is to be given to one

- (i) who does not know or

^{d-d}Sp VI 1172,11-16 ^{e-e}Sp VI 1172,25f. ^{f-f}Vin II 58,33f. ^{g-g}Sp VI 1181,5-10

¹ Being in good standing (*pakatatta*) means that he is a monk in good standing who is able to take part in all procedures of the community. Thus he reaches this status temporarily for the time his probation is suspended.

² See Sp VI 1173,26-80,28.

(ii) does not remember the number of nights, in whole or in part, and
 (iii) to one who is in doubt in respect of this. But whether he knows
 the definite number of the offences [saying], “I have committed so
 many offences”, or not, is of no concern.^g The manner of giving this
 has been handed down in the Khandhaka.¹ But the explanation of the
 regulation is stated in detail in the Samantapāśādikā.²

(3) The other one ^h-is called “combining probation”³ (*samodhāna-parivāsa*). It is threefold:

- (3.1) “cancelling⁴ and combining” (*odhāna-samodhāna*),
- (3.2) “combining according to grade”⁵ (*aggha-samodhāna*) and
- (3.3) “combining of mixed [offences]” (*missaka-samodhāna*).

There (3.1) “cancelling and combining” (*odhāna-samodhāna*) is
 called the probation which is to be given to someone who, having com-
 mitted a secondary offence,⁶ conceals it; [it is to be given] by [51]

^h-hSp VI 1182,17–22

¹ See Vin II 58,32–60,19. (BD V 76ff.).

² See Sp VI 1181,1–82,16.

³ *odhāna-samodhāna*; CPD s.v. “(t.t. vinaya) combination in the manner of inclusion (of a new probation period in the originally prescribed probation period by cancelling the days on which a monk has already been on probation)”; DOP s.v. “being inclusive (punishment) for a further offence involving starting again from the beginning the original punishment imposed; being an inclusive penance for more than one offence”. Kkh-nt 264,15 explains: *odhunitvā avadhuya pahāya samodhāno odhānasamodhāno*. “Combining having cancelled, wiped out, given up [means] **cancelling and combining**”. Vin-vn-t I 255,2f. explains *odhānasamodhāna* as a dvandva compound (*odhānañ ca samodhānañ ca odhānasamodhānam*. “*Odhāna-samodhāna* [means]: cancelling and combining”). Since the last explanation as a dvandva fits in very well with the description of this type of probation, we translate *odāna-samodhāna-parivāsa* as “probation consisting in cancelling and combining”, meaning that the days already spent under probation for a previously committed and concealed offence are cancelled, and the penance for the former and the latter offence are now combined.

⁴ *odhāna*, DOP s.v. “being placed in; inclusion”; CPD s.v. “inclusion”; Vin-vn-t I 254,26 explains *odhānam* by *makkhanam*, “wiping out, erasing”, and refers to the synonymous verbal line *odhunitvā makkhetvā* used in Kkh 86,15 (see below) in the present context.

⁵ *aggha-samodhāna-parivāsa*, lit. “combining probation according to value”.

⁶ *antarāpatti*, so the translation by IBH, BD VI, 172 and n. 15. Cone, DOP, s.v. “an offence committed in the meantime (that is, before the expiration of a

178 *Bhikkhupātimokha: D. Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting* (86)

cancelling¹ [and] wiping out² the days he has [already] spent under probation [for the offence he previously committed and concealed] and by combining [the number of days for] the [concealed] offence committed afterwards with the number of days for the original (i.e. first) [offence].^{3–h}

(3.2) i—“Combining according to grade”⁴ (*aggha-samodhāna*) is called the probation to be given when, among many offences — one or two or three or many — all are concealed for a long time; [it then is to be given] for the remaining offences which, by number⁵ of nights were concealed for a shorter time [than those concealed for a long time], combined with the grade of those [offences concealed for a long time].^{6–i}

(3.3) j—“Combining of mixed [offences]” (*missaka-samodhāna*) is called the probation to be given, putting together offences with various types of subject matter.^j

This is a brief explanation in respect of the threefold “combining probation”, but the detailed [account] is stated in the Samantapāsādikā.⁷ This is the main explanation of the word “should undergo probation”.

k—*A further six nights (= days) (uttari chārattam, Pāt 22,5) means: six nights more than the probation.*

i–i Sp VI 1183,19–22 j–j Sp VI 1184,6f. k–k Sp III 629,28ff.

parivāsa or *mānatta* period); BHSD s.v. “a (repeated) offense performed during probation (*parivāsa*) and concealed”; CPD s.v. *antarāpatti* wrongly refers to the *antarāyikā āpatti*.

¹ *odhunitvā*; CPD s.v. *odhunāti* “1. to shake, to toss about; 2a. to throw down; b. to shake off, to get rid of; c. to exclude, to cancel”; DOP s.v. “shakes, shakes out or down; shakes off; discards, cancels.”

² *makkheti* is mostly used in the sense of “smear, paste, etc.” (PED s.v.); Childers s.v. in addition lists “rub out”; Sv-pṭ further equates it with *vidhamseti*, *apaneti* “destroy, remove” (Sv-pṭ III 298,18), and in the present context *makkhetvā* is given in a synonym line with *odhunitvā*, “cancel”, see above, n. 178, n. 1.

³ See Sp VI 1182,17–83,18.

⁴ *aggha* (Skt *argha*) lit. value. Since the probationary period depends on the time the respective offence was concealed, what is at stake here is how long an offence was concealed. The longer it was concealed, the longer the probationary period. Thus *aggha* here refers to the extent of an offence in terms of days.

⁵ *pariccheda*, lit. limit.

⁶ See Sp VI 1183,19–84,5.

⁷ See Sp VI 1184,6–22.

⟨87⟩

Saṅghādisesa Conclusion

179

⟨87⟩ Of the mānatta penance for bhikkhus¹ (bhikkhu-mānattaya, Pāt 22,6) means: of the state of paying respect to the bhikkhus (?),² that is to say, in order to propitiate [them].^{-k}

Must undertake [the six-night mānatta penance] (patipajjitabbam, Pāt 22,6) means: [the mānatta penance] must be practiced.

And the mānatta penance for bhikkhus is twofold by virtue of being (1) concealed or (2) unconcealed.

There, (1) for whomever there is an unconcealed offence, probation is not given to him, only penance (mānatta) must be given. This is unconcealed mānatta penance.

(2) For whomever there is a concealed [offence] the mānatta penance must be given to him at the end of the probation. That is called concealed mānatta penance. This is what is intended here. But for both of these, the method of giving and the explanation of the regulation is to be understood in the manner stated in the Samantapāśādikā.³

Here, however, this is the summary. If this one, having suspended the observance, goes to take it up at dawn, having gone to a place of the sort stated in respect of probation with at least four monks, having taken up [the mānatta penance with the words] “I take up the mānatta penance, I take up the [mānatta] observance”, having announced it to them, then [the observance] is to be undertaken [by him] in the former manner whether they have gone or not gone.

Where there may be a group of twenty (yattha siyā vīsatigāno, Pāt 22,7): here, “a group of twenty” means ^a-a Saṅgha of twenty, a group of it.

There (tattha, Pāt 22,7) means: there where there is a Bhikkhu Saṅgha which is a group of at least twenty.

He is to be reinstated (abbhetabbo, Pāt 22,8) means: he should be gone towards, he should be accepted; that is to say, he is to be restored by virtue of the procedure of reinstatement. Alternatively it means: he is to be summoned.^{-a}

^{a-a}Sp III 629,30–30,3

¹ The term mānatta is unclear, but the explanation of the penance bearing that name is given in full detail in the Vinaya.

² The v.l. reads “for the mānatta penance of bhikkhus” (resolution of compound).

³ Sp VI 1184,24–90,22.

180 *Bhikkhupātimokkha: D. Rules Entailing a Formal Meeting* 〈88〉

The procedure of reinstatement, however, by virtue of the text is spoken of in the Khandhaka,¹ by virtue of the regulation in the Samantapāśādikā.²

^b—*He is not reinstated (anabbhito, Pāt 22,9)* means: he is not reinstated (alternative form), he is not accepted; that is to say, he is without the procedure of reinstatement having been carried out; alternatively it means: he is not summoned.^{—b}

And those bhikkhus are censurable (te ca bhikkhū gārayhā, Pāt 22,9–10) means: whoever, knowing the deficiency, rehabilitates, those bhikkhus are blameworthy, and they have [committed] an offence, they have a fault. The meaning is they incur [an offence of] wrong doing.

〈88〉 *This is the ^cproper course there (ayam tattha sāmīci, Pāt 22,10)* means: this is the state of conforming with the Dhamma there, accompanying the supramundane Dhamma, the instruction and admonition, the nature of the proper way. The remainder here is of the exact manner stated.^{—c}

The commentary on the section of [rules entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha of the Kaṅkhāvitaranī, the commentary on the Pātimokkha, is finished.

^b—^bSp III 630,4f. ^c—^cSp III 630,5–8

¹ Vin II 39,23–40,16; 42,20–43,10, etc.

² Sp VI 1173,10–17; 1188,31ff. (?).

⟨89⟩*Aniyata 1 M*

181

⟨89⟩ [E. The Section of Indefinite Rules]

[I. The commentary on the first indefinite rule] [52]

[Now venerable sirs, these two indefinite rules come up for recitation.

(Vin III 187,1f.)]

[I. Aniy M: If any bhikkhu should take a seat together with a woman, one [man] with one [woman], in secret, on a screened seat convenient enough [for sexual intercourse, and if] a female lay follower whose word can be trusted, having seen him [with that woman], should speak concerning one or other of the three rules, [that is one entailing] defeat (pārājika) or a formal meeting of the Saṅgha (saṅghādisesa) or expiation (pācittiya), [then that] bhikkhu, if he acknowledges that he was sitting [there], is to be dealt with in accordance with one or other of the three rules, [that is, one entailing] defeat or a formal meeting of the Saṅgha or expiation. Or that bhikkhu is to be dealt with in accordance with whatever that female lay follower whose word can be trusted should say. This matter is indefinite.

(Vin III 188,17–24)]

In the recitation of the indefinite rules Now these (ime kho pana, Pāt 24,2), etc., is of the stated manner indeed.¹

With a woman (mātugāmena, Pāt 24,5) means: with a living human female, even one born on that very day.

One [man] with one [woman] (eko ekāya, Pāt 24,5) means: one bhikkhu together with one female called a woman.

In secret² (raho, Pāt 24,5) means: ^dsecret from the eyes. ^dAlthough “secret from the ear” has been handed down in the text (that is, the Vinaya),³ secret here is intended as “secret from the eye” only. For, even if

^{d–d}Vin III 188,33 ^{e–e}≠ Sp III 632,9–12

¹ This refers to the explanation given at the beginning of the pārājika and the Saṅghādisesa sections, namely “These (or now, these) means: turning towards [the rules] now to be mentioned” (ime or ime kho panā) ti idāni vattabbānam abhimukhikaraṇam, Kkh 28,7; 57,4), see above, pp. 55, 127.

² In Pāt this was translated as “privately”. Though this translation is not wrong from the point of view of content, it does not make it possible to construe the commentarial explanations in a lucid way.

³ In the Word Analysis to this rule, “in secret” (rāho) is explained as twofold: secret from the ear, and secret from the eye (Vin III 188,33). Tradition is unanimously

182

Bhikkhupātimokha E. Indefinite Rules

⟨89⟩

a knowledgeable man is seated at the door of a room with the door closed, by no means [can] he testify to [the monk's] non-offence.^{1-e} But one with eyes, sitting inside such a space^{-f} where it is possible to see, — ^feven at a distance of twelve cubits (about five metres)² — even when his mind is disturbed,³ even when he sleeps,⁴ [can] testify to [the bhikkhu's] non-offence. A blind person even if standing close by, [can] not testify. Even one furnished with eyes, who, having lain down, moreover (*api*) falls asleep,⁵ [can] not testify. Of women, however, even one hundred [can] by no means testify.^{-f} Therefore it is said, “*In secret* means secret from the eyes”.

On a screened seat (paticchanne āsane, Pāt 24.6) means: in a space concealed by walls, etc.

^g—*On a convenient enough [seat] (alaṅkammaniye, Pāt 24.6): “convenient” (kammaniyaṁ) means: appropriate for work, fit for work;*

^{f-f} ≠ Sp III 632,13-17 ^{g-g} Sp III 631,24-32,1

of the opinion that in case of the first Aniyata only “secret from the eye” is meant by *rāho*, and that “secret from the ear” is only noted in the Word Analysis to give all meanings the word *rāho* can possibly have. For this way of interpreting the method of the Word Analysis, see Kieffer-Püllz 2013: II 887-95.

¹ *anāpattiñ karoti*, literally “makes, effects a non-offence [for the monk]” by his testimony. Since the door is closed, the man seated at the door cannot see the monk, and thus is not capable of testifying to his offence or non-offence. This shows that the man’s capability of hearing does not acquit the monk hereby of an offence, which is a first proof that *rāho* cannot refer to “secret from the ear” in this context.

² That means one is out of hearing range (Sp-t II 379,26-80,2; Vmv I 305,18ff.). This is the second proof that *rāho* here does refer to “secret from the eyes” only, not to “secret from the ears”.

³ *vikkhitta-citta* means that he may be partially unconscious. For *khitta-citta*, in the same meaning, see above, p. 70, n. 2.

⁴ According to the subcommentaries, such a one does not fall into deep sleep, but only into a light slumber, sometimes opening, sometimes closing his eyes (Kkh-nt 269,20ff. = Sp-t II 380,2-5; shorter Vmv I 306,1ff.).

⁵ Unlike a person who can see, sitting within the range of vision, who may testify to a non-offence even when out of his mind (*vikkhitta-citto*) or having fallen asleep (*niddāyanto*, Kkh 89,21), the present person lies down and then falls asleep. The commentators assume that the first person sleeps only lightly whereas the second sleeps soundly (Sp-t II 380,2-7 = Kkh-nt 269,20-24).

⟨90⟩*Aniyata 1 M*

183

“convenient enough” (*alaṅkammaniyam*) means: capable enough for the state of being convenient; on such a convenient enough [seat]. ⟨90⟩ The meaning is: Where, committing¹ a [sexual] transgression, they are able to do that action, on such a [seat].^{-g}

^h—*Should take a seat (nisajjam kappayya, Pāt 24.6)* means: should make a seat; the meaning is: should sit down.^{-h} And here lying down, too, is included in sitting.

ⁱ—*Whose word can be trusted (saddheyavacasā, Pāt 24.7)* means: whose word is to be trusted (alternative form);⁻ⁱ the meaning is: a noble female lay follower.²

^j—*The bhikkhu, if he acknowledges that he was sitting [there] (nisajjam bhikkhu patijānamāno, Pāt 24.9)* means: although such a female lay follower speaks having seen him, nevertheless the bhikkhu is to be dealt with in accordance with one or other of the three rules only if he acknowledges that he was sitting [there], not if he does not acknowledge [it]. That is] the meaning.

^k—*Or in accordance with whatever that (yena vā sā, Pāt 24.11)* means: or in accordance with whatever detail among the details such as sitting, etc., that lay follower should speak, accusing [him] of sexual intercourse, etc.; only if he acknowledges it is the bhikkhu to be dealt with in accordance with that [speech], for he is not to be dealt with in accordance with a detail which consists merely in the speech of a female lay follower, even such a one (i.e. such a trustworthy lay follower). [That is] the meaning. Why? Since what has been seen may be thus or otherwise.^{-j}

^l—*This rule is indefinite (ayam dhammo aniyato, Pāt 24.12f.)* means: it is indefinite because of the fact that [the bhikkhu] is to be dealt with by virtue of that offence or subject matter he acknowledges among the three offences.

[This rule] was pronounced at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) with reference to Elder Udāyi (= 2. *individual*) on the subject matter “taking a seat together with a woman on a seat of the stated form” (= 3. *subject matter*).

^{h-h}Sp III 632,3f.

ⁱ⁻ⁱSp III 632,17f.

^{j-j}Sp III 632,23-31

¹ Kkh 90,1 reads *karonto* without variant. In that case, only the monk could be the subject; but Kkh B^e and Sp E^e III 629,27 (no variants) read *karontā*. Kkh 90,1 should be corrected accordingly.

² A woman who is at least a Stream-winner (*sotāpanna*).

184

Bhikkhupātimokha E. Indefinite Rules

⟨91⟩

[The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

In all actions, starting with ^{k-}collyrium for the eyes, etc., [done] because of the desire to go into the presence of a woman out of a secret pleasure^{-k} which is counted as a defilement connected with sexual intercourse, there is [an offence of] wrong doing. Having gone, whether the woman should sit down when he is already seated, or he should sit down when she is already seated, or they both should sit down simultaneously, there is [an offence entailing] expiation [for the bhikkhu] for the sitting down of the two. But if he engages in bodily contact or sexual intercourse, he is to be dealt with by virtue of the [respective offences]. Exactly the same principle [applies] also for lying down¹ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence by reason of sitting down with no desire for secrecy, and intent on other things for [a bhikkhu] standing, when a man of the stated sort,² having lain down, not asleep, not blind, [being] a knowledgable man, is within the precinct (*upacāra*).³ But there is no offence even by reason of these three offences for those who are insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

It would be a failure of virtuous conduct, it would be a ⟨91⟩ failure of right behaviour (= 8. *failure*).

But whatever [53] offence [the bhikkhu] acknowledges, by virtue of that the types of constituent factors [valid for the respective offence] are to be known (= 9. *constituent factors*).

^{k-}Sp III 634.5f.

¹ At Kkh 90,24, this sentence begins a new paragraph, although it belongs to the preceding section. The new paragraph begins after this sentence.

² This refers to the description of a knowledgable man, able to see, testifying to a non-offence in Kkh 89,20f., see above, p. 182.

³ *upacāra* means the precincts of a house (*gharīpacāra*, see for instance Kkh 41,13–18; see above, pp. 94f.), of a vihāra (*vihārassa upacāra*, Kkh 159,16), or of a village (*gāmūpacāra*, for instance Kkh 41,22f., see above, p. 96). It is a quite narrow range in case of a house, the distance a woman may throw the washing water, a pestle, or a winnowing fan outdoors, etc., (see Kieffer-Püllz 1992: 316). In the case of a village, it is one stone's throw. In the present case it is to be assumed that the witness is not too far away from the bhikkhu in question.

⟨91⟩

Aniyata 2 M

185

The origin (= 10. *sorts of origin*), etc.¹ are exactly the same as for the first [rule entailing] defeat (Pār 1 M).

The commentary on the first indefinite rule is finished.

[2. The commentary on the second indefinite rule]

[2. Aniy M: *[It may be that] the seat is not screened [or] not convenient enough [for sexual intercourse], but it is convenient for addressing a woman with lewd words. Should any bhikkhu take a seat with a woman, one [man] with one [woman] in secret, on such a seat, then a female lay follower whose word can be trusted, having seen him [with that woman], should speak concerning one of the two rules — [that is, one entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha (saṅghādisesa) or expiation (pācittiya) — [then that] bhikkhu, if he acknowledges that he was sitting [there], is to be dealt with in accordance with one of the two rules, [that is, one entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha or expiation. Or that bhikkhu is to be dealt with in accordance with whatever that female lay follower whose word can be trusted should say. This matter also is indefinite.*

(Vin III 191,27–92,2)]

In the second rule ^a—whoever is knowledgeable — be it woman or man — is not blind, not deaf, [and] is either standing or sitting within a twelve cubit space, even when [his mind] is disturbed, even when he sleeps, [can] testify to a non-offence. But a deaf man, even one furnished with eyes, or a blind man, even if not deaf, [can] not testify [to either offence or non-offence]. Setting aside the [offence entailing] defeat, the difference is that [the second indefinite rule] is said to be an offence of lewd words. The remainder^{—a} is to be understood exactly in accordance with the previous manner.² But the origins (= 10. *sorts of origin*), etc., here are exactly the same as for [the rule about] taking what is not given (Pār 2 M).

The commentary on the second indefinite rule is finished.

^a—^aSp III 635,4–9

¹ “Etc.” refers to the remaining six factors, 11. *kiriya*, 12. *saññā-vimokkha*, 13. *sacittaka*, 14. *lokavajja*, 15. *kamma*, and 16. *citta*, and 17. *vedanā*; see above, pp. 81ff.

² This refers to the classification of the first Aniyata.

186

Bhikkhupātimokha E. Indefinite Rules

⟨91⟩

[*Recited, venerable sirs, are the two indefinite rules. There, I ask the venerable ones, “Are you pure in this?” A second time I ask, “Are you pure in this?” A third time I ask, “Are you pure in this?” The venerable ones are pure in this; therefore they are silent. Thus I record it.*

(Vin III 194.1-5])

*Recited (uddiṭṭhā kho, Pāt 26.1), etc. is to be understood everywhere in just the stated manner.*¹

The commentary on the indefinite rules of the Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī, the commentary on the Pātimokha, is finished.

¹ This refers to the explanations of the same words at the end of the Pārājika (Kkh 55.23ff., see above, pp. 124f.) and the Saṅghādisesa (Kkh 82.17ff., see above, p. 170) sections.

⟨92⟩*Nissaggiyapācittiya 1 M*

187

| ⟨92⟩ [F. The Section of Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture]

| [Now, venerable sirs, the thirty rules entailing expiation with forfeiture
| come up for recitation.]

| From here on, however, Now (*ime kho pana*, Pāt 28,2), etc., is to be
| understood everywhere in the stated way.¹

| [I. The section about robes]

| [I. The commentary on the rule about *kathina*]²

| [I. Niss M: The robe [matters] having been settled by a bhikkhu,³ the
| *kathina* having been removed,⁴ an extra robe is to be worn for ten days
| at most. For one exceeding that, there is an offence entailing expiation
| with forfeiture.

| (Pāt 28,6-8 = Vin III 196,9ff.)]

| In the rules about expiation, in the first rule of the section about
| robes, the robe material⁵ having been settled⁶ (*nīṭṭhita-cīvaraśmiṇ*,
| Pāt 28,6) initially⁷ means: the robe material has been settled either with
| the end of the act of sewing, or alternatively for some reason or other
| among these, [i.e. the robe material] b-is lost or destroyed or burnt or an
| expectation of [receiving] robe material is disappointed.^{-b} The meaning
| is: when the impediment for making robes has been removed. For, as
| long as the robes impediment⁸ is not removed for him by one of the

| b-b Vin III 196,13f.

| ¹ With this reference back to his explanation of the same words in the
| Saṅghādisesa, and Aniyata sections (see above, pp. 127, 181), the commentator
| comments on these words for the last time.

| ² *kathina*, see Appendix 19.

| ³ *nīṭṭhita-cīvaraśmiṇ*, see Appendix 20.

| ⁴ *ubbhataśmiṇ kāṭhine*, see Appendix 21.

| ⁵ *cīvara* here must include ready-made as well as unmade cloth (that is, material
| cut up and sewn in the robe pattern and unprepared robe material). This is dis-
| cussed at some length in subcommentarial literature (Kieffer-Püllz 2013: II [Z
| 137] [1]).

| ⁶ See Appendix 22.

| ⁷ The commentator says this because the same phrase appears again in the next
| two rules where he gives further explanations.

| ⁸ *cīvara-palibodha*. The robes impediment is based on a bhikkhu's right to
| obtain a share of robes from the residence in which he lives if this residence

188 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture* 〈92〉

reasons [given above], for so long [a period] a bhikkhu for whom the *kathina* had been spread out obtains the *kathina* privilege[s].

The kathina having been removed (ubbhataśmī kathine, Pāt 28,6) means: whatever *kathina* has been spread out for the Saṅgha, that too having been removed.¹

There, the spreading out of the *kathina* and [its] removal has to be briefly understood in the following way.² Because the spreading out of the *kathina* was allowed³ by the Blessed One⁴ for those who had kept the earlier rains [retreat] (*purima-vassam**),⁵ it is suitable for at least five people. Therefore, where there are four or three or two or one who have entered the earlier rains [retreat], there, [the *kathina* robe] might be spread out⁶ having made some who have kept the later rains [retreat] (*pacchima-vassam**) to complete the quorum.⁷ But the [latter] are only the ones who fill the quorum; they do not receive the [*kathina*] privileges.

has started the *kathina* period. As long as the robe question is not settled for him, and as long as the *kathina* period continues, his claim is not fulfilled, and thus it constitutes an impediment to ending the *kathina* period. See Kieffer-Püllz 1992: 115f. See also below, p. 192, n. 1; p. 203, n. 1.

¹ That means removed for the individual bhikkhu. This does not necessarily mean that it has been removed for the Saṅgha too, see Appendix 22.

² Kkh 92,18 reads *etam* without v.l., but Kkh B^e has *tatr' evam*. This latter phrase is quite common, whereas *tatr' etam* is only found once in the seventeenth-century Vinayalaṇikā-tūkā (Pālim-nt I 416,28).

³ As is well known, *anuññāta* can mean prescribed or allowed, depending on whether a regulation is tightened or relaxed. Since the *kathina* period entails relaxing rules for the bhikkhus for the length of the *kathina* period by suspending a number of rules — the so-called *kathina* privileges (*kathināni-saṃsa*) — and since it prolongs the time period during which the bhikkhus are allowed to receive clothes, it should be understood to mean “allowed” in this context. See also above, p. 8, n. 3.

⁴ See Vin I 254,7ff. (BD IV 352f.).

⁵ Kkh 92,20 “*anuññāto.*;” the full stop must be replaced by a comma since the sentence *ayam hi ... anuññāto*” is the explanatory statement for the second part of the sentence (Kkh 92,20f.: *so ... vatṭatī*).

⁶ Once the *kathina* robe is spread out the *kathina* period is opened, and at the same time the *kathina* privileges come into being.

⁷ The quorum (*gāna*) is the number of bhikkhus or bhikkhunīs required as a minimum to carry out a procedure (*kamma**), in this case, five.

⟨93⟩

Nissaggiyapācittiya 1 M

189

Therefore, if anyone among householders or wanderers, impartially [and] justly, gives robe material (or: a robe) to those who have kept the earlier rains [retreat saying], “With this, spread out the *kaṭhina* [robe]¹”,¹ that is to be given to a bhikkhu who is worthy of spreading out the *kaṭhina* [robe]² with the formula (*kamma-vācā**) for the procedure [with a decision as] the second [element] after [putting] the motion (*ñatti-dutiya-kamma**) which is stated in the Khandhaka.³

⟨93⟩ Having cut it into five or more pieces on that very day, an outer robe (*saṅghāti*) or an upper robe (*uttarāsaṅga*) or a lower robe (*antara-vāsaka*) should be made by him (i.e. the *kaṭhina-atthāraka*). The other bhikkhus must be his assistants. If a ready-made robe (*kata-cīvara*) turns up, that is good. But [if it is] uncut and unsewn, it is not suitable. If that bhikkhu is desirous of spreading out an outer robe [as a *kaṭhina* robe], having formally given up⁴ [his] old outer robe, [54] having formally taken possession of the new outer robe, it is to be spread out by him with the words, “I spread out the *kaṭhina* [robe] with this outer robe.” Exactly the same method also [applies] to the upper robe and the lower robe.

Then approaching the bhikkhus who have spent the earlier rains [retreat] within the same boundary (*sīmā*), [this] is to be said by him, “Venerable sirs, the *kaṭhina* [robe] has been spread out for the Saṅgha; the spreading out of the *kaṭhina* [robe] is lawful. Rejoice.”^d

c—c Vin V 176,26f. d—d Vin V 177,5f.

¹ The robe or robe material is to be given to a bhikkhu who is spreading the *kaṭhina* (*kaṭhinatthāraka*; Vin V 176,21f.) as *kaṭhina* cloth (*kaṭhina-dussa*) in a *ñatti-dutiya-kamma** (Vin V 176,21f.). It then has to be made into one of the three bhikkhu’s robes (*ti-cīvara*) according to specific rules (Vin I 254,25ff.; V 176,22ff.), and thereafter to be spread out as a *kaṭhina* robe to open the *kaṭhina* period.

² Originally it could be given to any bhikkhu (Vin I 254,14–25, BD IV 353f.); later this one is called “the one who is spreading the *kaṭhina* robe” (*kaṭhinatthāraka*, Vin V 176,22ff.). For the ceremony, see Bechert 1968: 319–29; Kieffer-Pülz 2000: 394ff.; Aggacitta 2001 offers an overview of all the elements connected to the ceremony, and this may serve as a general introduction.

³ See Vin I 254,14–25 (BD IV 353f.).

⁴ *paccuddharati* is the formal giving up of some object one has formally taken possession of before.

190 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture* 〈93〉

[This] is to be said [by him] considering [what] is suitable for elders, for newly ordained bhikkhus, for many, and for one.¹ By them too, having said, “Venerable sir, the *kathina* [robe] has been spread out for the Saṅgha”, or “Friend, the *kathina* [robe] has been spread out for the Saṅgha”, [the following] is to be said, “The spreading out of the *kathina* [robe] is lawful. We rejoice”, or “I rejoice.”

Even among those who have spent the earlier rains [retreat], only for those who rejoice, the *kathina* is spread out.² From that time up to the removal of the *kathina*, they receive the [following] five privileges:

- e– (i) going out without asking permission (*anāmanta-cāra*),³
- (ii) going out without taking [the three robes] (*asamādāna-cāra*),⁴
- (iii) [taking] as many robes as they require (*yāvadattha-cīvaram*),⁵
- (iv) food [accepted] by a group (*gāṇa-bhojanam*),⁶ and
- (v) whatever accrual of robes is there,^{7–e} and the robe material

^{e–e}Vin I 254.9f.

¹ This means the bhikkhu who is spreading the *kathina* robe has to choose the way of addressing the other bhikkhus and the verbs to use in conformity to the number of bhikkhus (singular or plural) and in conformity to their ordination age: “Venerable Sirs” (*bhante*) for bhikkhus ordained before the speaker or “friends” (*āvuso*) for those ordained after him. See Kkh-nt 276,28f.: “*bhante, āvuso*” *ti ca* “*anumodatha, anumodāhī*” *ti ca vacanabhedam sandhāya therānañ cā* *ti ādi vuttam*. “With reference to the vocal utterance, ‘venerable sirs, friends’ and ‘rejoice’ (2nd per. pl.), ‘rejoice’ (2nd per. sing.) it is said [in the Kañkhāvitaraṇī]: **and to the elders**, etc.”

² In the earlier description of the *kathina* ceremony in the *Mahāvagga*, the ceremony for opening the *kathina* period is not described as such. But according to the *Parivāra*, the ceremony consists of two parts, namely, first, the *kathina* spreader spreads out the *kathina* robe and informs the Saṅgha, a group (*gāṇa*), or an individual bhikkhu that he has spread the *kathina* robe in accordance with the rules, and, second, the rejoicing of the bhikkhus (Vin V 172,7ff.; 176,18–77,13).

³ Relaxation of Pācittiya 46 M, see below, p. 394.

⁴ Relaxation of Nissaggiya 2 M, see below, pp. 202f.

⁵ Relaxation of Nissaggiya 1 M, see pp. 187ff.

⁶ Relaxation of Pācittiya 32 M, see below, pp. 350ff.

⁷ The *ānisamsas* are given in different sequences in Vin and Kkh (Vin *gāṇabhojanam yāvadattha-cīvaram* compared to Kkh *yāvadattha-cīvaram gāṇabhojanam*), and the fifth *ānisamsa* is formulated slightly differently (Vin *yo ca tattha cīvaruppādo so nesañ bhavissati*, compared to Kkh: *yo ca tattha cīvaruppādo, tasmiṁ āvāse saṅghassa upannacīvaram ca*).

⟨93⟩

Nissaggiyapācittiya 1 M

191

accrued for the Saṅgha in that residence (*yo ca tattha cīvaruppādo, tasmiṃ āvāse saṅghassa uppannacīvaraṃ ca*).¹

This is, first of all, spreading out the *kaṭhina*.

But this very *kathina* is removed by virtue of one or other among the eight grounds (*māttikā*) stated as follows: ^f—There are these eight grounds for the removal of the *kaṭhina*, bhikkhus:

- (i) dependent on going out (*pakkamanantikā*),
- (ii) dependent on being settled (*niṭṭhānantikā*),
- (iii) dependent on a decision (*sannīṭṭhānantikā*),
- (iv) dependent on being lost (*nāsanantikā*),
- (v) dependent on hearing (*savanantikā*),
- (vi) dependent on cutting off hopes (*āsavacchedikā*),
- (vii) dependent on crossing the boundary (*sīmātikkamanantikā*),
- (viii) with the removal (*sah' ubbhārā*).^{”f}

There, the detailed regulation is to be understood in the manner stated in the Samantapāśādikā. Thus by the words, *the kathina having been removed (ubbhatasmiṃ kathine, Pāt 28,6)*, [the text of the Pātimokkha] shows the

^f—Sp III 638,15–18

¹ The regular counterpart to *yo ca tattha cīvaruppādo* is *nesañ bhavissati* (“it will belong to them”) in all texts except the present passage of Kkh. The first *ca* after *yo* links this fifth *ānisamsa* to the four preceding ones. As we can see from Sp (V 1107,6ff, see below) in the commentary on *yo ca tattha cīvaruppādo*, its author includes any type of cloth [material] that accrued to the order, and gives three examples. The second sentence in Kkh most probably is intended to summarize this statement, since Kkh-ṇṭ presents exactly this passage from Sp, albeit without mentioning the source. Sp V 1107,6–9 = Kkh-ṇṭ 277,24–27: *yo ca tattha cīvaruppādo ti* (Vin I 254,10) *tattha kathinatthatasīmāyam* (Kkh-ṇṭ *kathina*^o) *matakacīvaraṃ vā hotu saṅgham uddissa dinnam vā saṅghikena tatr' uppādena ābhataṃ vā yena kenaci ākārena yam saṅghikam cīvaraṃ uppajjati, tam tesam bhavissatī ti attho.* “**Whatever accrual of robes is there** means: whatever robe [material] belonging to the Saṅgha accrues there by whatever means, be it the robe [material] of a dead [person] within the boundary where the *kathina* has been spread, or one given having it assigned to the Saṅgha, or one brought [in exchange?] for an accrual there belonging to the Saṅgha, [all] that will belong to them.” The boundary (*sīmā*) mentioned in this connection refers to the surrounding boundary (*upacāra-sīmā*) according to Vjb 488,11; quoted in Pālim-ṇṭ II 141,1f.

192 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture* 〈94〉

absence of any remaining impediment.¹

^g—*For ten days at the most (dasāha-paramam, Pāt 28,6f.): having ten days as the maximum (dasāha-paramo) means: ten days are the maximum limit for it. The meaning is: it may be worn for a time consisting of ten days as the maximum.*^{—g} 〈94〉

^h—*An extra robe (atireka-cīvaraṁ, Pāt 28,7) means: a robe which is extra because it is not included in those [robes] formally taken possession of (*adhiṭṭhāti**) or formally assigned (*vikappeti**).^{—h} “Robe [material]” (*cīvara*) means: ⁱ—linen, cotton, silk, wool, hemp, and canvas^{—i} — one or other of them or something in accordance with them. This is its quality. But from the point of view of size, the smallest [size] suitable for assignment is intended here. For this is said [in the Vinaya], ^j—“I prescribe, bhikkhus, as the least robe material to be assigned, one that is eight finger [breadths] (*aṅgula**) in length and four finger [breadths] (*aṅgula**) wide according to the current finger breadth.”^{2—j}*

Regarding the words “not included in those [robes] which are formally taken possession of, or formally assigned” (Kkh 94.1), the necessity of formally taking possession of, or formally assigning are to be understood according to the [following] manner: ^k—“I prescribe, bhikkhus, to formally take possession of the three robes, not to formally assign them; to formally take possession of the cloth for the rains for the four months [of the rains], after that [time] to formally assign it; to formally take possession of a sitting [cloth],³ not to formally assign it; to formally take possession of a covering, not to formally assign it; to formally take possession of an itch-cloth while the disease lasts, after that [time] to formally assign it; to formally take possession of a cloth for wiping the

^{g—g}Sp III 638,28ff.

^{h—h}Sp III 639,4ff.

^{i—i}Sp III 639,7f.

^{j—j}≠ Vin I 297,13ff.

^{k—k}Vin I 297,3–10

¹ The two impediments opposing the removal of the *kathina* are the robes impediment (*cīvara-palibodha*), and the residence impediment (*āvāsa-palibodha*), that is, a bhikkhu’s relationship to the residence he lives in. See Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 115f.

² That is about fourteen to seven centimetres.

³ *nisīdana*; in order to differentiate between the word *nisīdana* and the word *nisīdana-santhata* (the latter only appears in Niss 15 M, but not in Kkh) the first is rendered as “sitting [cloth]”, the second as “sitting rug”.

⟨94⟩

Nissaggiyapācittiya 1 M

193

face, not to formally assign it; to formally take possession of a requisite cloth, not to formally assign it".^k

^a—There, by one formally taking possession of the set of three robes, having dyed it, [and] having put a legalizing dot on [it],^l it is to be formally taken possession of only if it is of the right measure. Its measure at maximum is suitable [if it is] smaller than a current robe.² As a minimum, firstly, for the outer robe [55] and upper robe, they should be five fist lengths³ in length and three fist lengths in width. The lower robe is suitable [if it is] five fist lengths in length and even two cubits' (*hattha*^{*}) lengths in width.^{a b}—But anything larger or smaller than the stated size is to be formally taken possession of as cloth for the requisites.⁴

There, because it is said [in the Vinaya], ^c—“There are two [types of] formally taking possession of a robe:

- (i) formally taking possession of physically,
- (ii) formally taking possession of verbally”,^c

therefore having formally given up (*paccuddharati*^{*}) the old outer robe with the words, “I formally give up this outer robe”,

^a—^aSp III 643,3–8

^b—^bSp III 643,9–16

^c—^cVin V 117,38–18,1

¹ *kappa-bindu*, a legalizing dot is a small black (?) dot applied to a robe in one to four corners of the robe. According to Sp (IV 863,22) it is like the roundel of a peacock's eye or the back or upper side of a *maṅgula* fish (?) (v.l. *maṅkuṇa*); without it, the robe is not legally allowed.

² For *sugata* in the sense of “current”, see Schlingloff 1963: 543f. As pointed out by Schlingloff, the word *sugata* (the “Well-Gone”), which is also used as an epithet of the Buddha, gave grounds for a gross misunderstanding when the word *sugata-cīvara* was understood as “the Well-Gone's robe” instead of the “current robe”. It has been misunderstood early on as referring to the special size of the Buddha's robe which was not allowed to be exceeded in size by an average bhikkhu's cloth, whereas originally, the regulation only meant that a bhikkhu's robe should be smaller than a current worldly robe.

³ *muṭhi*^{*} (Skt *muṣṭi*) “the fist” as a measure of length is to be found only in this passage and its literal parallel in Sp III 643,3–8. It seems to be a cubit (*hattha*^{*} or *ratana*^{*}) measured with the hand clinched in a fist (about 36 cm).

⁴ For the possibility of formally taking possession of a larger number of cloths independent of their size, namely as cloth for requisites, see Kieffer-Pülz 2007: 41ff.

194 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture* 〈95〉

(i) [the new outer robe] is to be formally taken possession of physically by him making a body gesture [by] touching the new [outer robe] with his hand forming the deliberate thought in his mind, “I formally take possession of this outer robe”;^{-b} 〈95〉

(ii) ^d or it is to be formally taken possession of verbally [in] making a verbal utterance.

There, formally taking possession of [verbally] (*adhitthāna*) is twofold.

(a) If [the outer robe] is within arm’s reach (*hattha-pāsa**), [he] should break into speech, “I formally take possession of this outer robe (*saṅghāti*).”

(b) Or [if] it is in an inner room, etc., or in a neighbouring *vihāra*,¹ considering the place where it has been deposited, [he] should break into speech, “I formally take possession of this outer robe.” The same method [applies] to an upper robe (*uttarāsaṅga*) and a lower robe (*antaravāsaka*). For only the name is different. Therefore they are all to be formally taken possession of, each with its own name, thus: “the outer robe, the upper robe, the lower robe”.

If he makes an outer robe (*saṅghāti*), etc., from cloths having been formally taken possession of [and] deposited,² when the dyeing and [putting on] the legalizing spot (*kappabindu*) have been finished, having formally given [it] up with the words “I formally give this up,”³ they are to be formally taken possession of anew.^{-d} But this set of three robes (*ticivara*) may even be formally taken possession of as a requisite cloth (*parikkhāra-cola*) for easy usage.⁴

^{d-d}Sp III 643,18–28

¹ *sāmanta-vihāra* “neighbouring *vihāra*”; what is subsumed under this term is discussed diversely in commentarial literature, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I [Z 139]. Kkh 95,5 reads “hoti.”; the full stop should be deleted.

² Cloths which a bhikkhu deposits have to be formally taken possession of in advance, whether as coverings (*paccattharana*), or requisite cloth (*parikkhāra-cola*), etc. If a bhikkhu decides to make an outer robe from these cloths, he has to formally give up the cloth previously taken possession of formally in order to be able to formally take possession of it as an outer robe, etc. For more details, see Kieffer-Pülz 2007: 37f.

³ In this case the object to be formally given up is not mentioned, since it depends on the category it came under when it was formally taken possession of. Following the commentary, however, it is not necessary to mention the object explicitly (Kkh-nṭ 282,19ff.).

⁴ This means that a bhikkhu can formally take possession of a set of three robes

¹The rains cloth (*vassika-sātikā*), which may not surpass the [maximum] size,¹ should be formally taken possession of for the four rainy months just in the stated manner having mentioned [it] by name.² After those [rainy months] it should be formally given up [and then] formally assigned. And it is suitable even if it is dyed merely with dissolving colours.³ But two are not suitable.⁴

The sitting [cloth] (*nīśidana*) is to be formally taken possession of in the stated way indeed. And this is one only, of the correct size.⁵ Two are not suitable.

The covering (*paccattharāṇa*) too is to be formally taken possession of indeed. But large or one or many are suitable. Even all sorts are suitable: blue, yellow, with a fringe, as well as with a flowery fringe.

The “itch-covering cloth” (*kaṇḍu-ppaṭicchādi*), having [the right] size,⁶ is to be formally taken possession of for as long as the illness lasts. When the illness is over, it is to be formally given up, [and] to be formally assigned. Only one is suitable.

¹e-eSp III 644,21–45,1

as a requisite cloth. This enables him to have several sets of three robes and to use them without being concerned about the rules enacted for the three robes. For a discussion of this regulation, see Kieffer-Pülz 2007: 35ff. with n. 147. See also below, Appendix 23.

¹ Its measure is six spans (*vidatthi**) in length, two-and-a-half spans in width according to the current span (Vin IV 172,31f., BD III 99), that is about 132 cm to 55 cm.

² *nāmam gahetvā*; in that case the name of the cloth has to be stated explicitly. This is stressed because there are other clothes such as, for instance, a covering (*paccattharāṇa*) which must not be named explicitly when taken possession of, that is, where it suffices to say “this” (*etam*).

³ That is, it is suitable, even if the dyeing does not fit the normal dyeing of a robe. As a reason for this allowance, the commentaries state this to be the case because the *vassika-sātikā* is used for bathing too (Kkh-nṭ 283,23f.).

⁴ This simply is the case, because only one can be formally taken possession of at a time.

⁵ It measures two spans (*vidatthi**) in length according to the current span, one and a half in width (Vin IV 170,30f.), that is, about 44 cm to 33 cm, plus a border of one span’s breadth.

⁶ It spreads from below the navel to above the knees, and measures four spans (*vidatthi**) in length and two in width (Vin IV 172,11–14, BD III 97f.), that is, about 76 to 88 cm and 38 to 44 cm. Kkh 95,21 is to be read *tāva pamāṇikā* for *tāvapamāṇikā*.

196 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture* 〈96〉

A face wiping cloth (*mukha-puñchana-cola*) is to be formally taken possession of indeed.^e But one or many or large is suitable indeed.

^f There is no counting regarding the requisite cloth (*parikkhāra-cola*). As many as he wishes, as many are to be formally taken possession of indeed.

A bag and a water-strainer, of the smallest size suitable for assignment, are to be formally taken possession of indeed as requisite cloth. Putting many together 〈96〉 it is suitable indeed to formally take possession [of them] by way [of saying] “I formally take possession of these cloths as requisite cloths”, etc.^f

^g But there is no obligation to formally take possession of [items] in respect of these: bolsters for beds, bolsters for benches, pillows, mantles,¹ [and] fleeces,² and in respect of coverings given as requisites for the dwellings.^{–g} But all of this robe material formally taken possession of in the stated way loses its [status of having been] formally taken possession of for the following eight reasons:

- ^h–(i) because of giving to another,
- (ii) because of taking by [those] having deprived one [of it],
- (iii) because of taking on trust,
- (iv) because of turning to a lower way of life,
- (v) because of giving up the training,
- (vi) because of death,
- (vii) because of changing the sexual characteristic,
- (viii) because of formally giving up.^{3–h}

But the three robes lose their [status of having been taken possession of formally] even because of a hole the size of the back of the nail of the little finger; [56] but that only by being pierced through. ⁱ For if inside the hole, even a single thread is unbroken, [this] indeed protects [the status of having been formally taken possession of].

^{f–f}Sp III 645,4–9

^{g–g}Sp III 645,11–14

^{h–h}Sp III 645,16ff.

^{i–i}Sp III 645,24–29

¹ *pāvāra* “mantle”; for more details regarding this cloth, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 140] n. 42, 44; [Z 202].

² *kojava* “fleece”; see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 140] n. 44; [Z 202].

³ Sp III 645,19f. lists nine grounds, adding the existence of a hole (*chiddabāva*). This is dealt with in Kkh in the subsequent paragraph, but in the list, the author of Kkh clearly enumerates only eight *mātikās* (“grounds”).

There, a hole [in] the outer robe and the upper robe inside an area of a span's (*vidatthi**) measure from the longitudinal edges, [and] of the measure of eight finger [breadths] (*aṅgula**) from the lateral edges breaks the [status of having been] formally taken possession of.¹ In the case of the lower robe, too, the measure from the longitudinal edge⁻ⁱ is the same, but according to the lateral [edge], four finger [breadths] (*aṅgula**) is to be understood. Of all three [robes, a hole]^j beyond this stated area does not break [the status of having been formally taken possession of]. Therefore, when a hole occurs [inside the stated area], the three robes remain in the state of [being] extra robes. Having done the needlework [to repair the hole, they] are to be formally taken possession of anew.^j

The rains cloth loses [its status of having been] formally taken possession of with the passing of the months of the rainy season, and the itch-covering cloth with the calming of the illness. Therefore, after that, these [two] are to be formally assigned. But the characteristics of formally assigning I shall describe only in the rule about formally assigning for all robes (Pāc 59 M). For, just in that place, whatever [cloth] has not been formally taken possession of and has not been formally assigned is to be understood as an extra robe (*atireka-cīvara*).

^k—For one exceeding that, there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture (*tam atikkāmayato nissaggiyam pācittiyam*, Pāt 28,⁷⁻⁸) means: for one exceeding a time of ten days as a maximum regarding a robe of the above stated quality and measurements, who within that interim period [of ten days] does not act in such a way that [the extra robe] does

^{j-j}Sp III 646,1ff. ^{k-k}Sp III 639,14-22

¹ Since a bhikkhu's robes consist in cloth of a given size, and since even a hole of the size of the back of the little finger leads to the loss of the status of having been taken possession of formally, the measures given here cannot refer to the size of the hole. What is defined here is rather in which part of the robe a hole has an effect on formally taking possession of it, and in which part it has none. In the case of the outer and upper robes, each hole farther inside than about 22 cm from the right and left edge of the cloth (lengthwise) or farther inside than about 14.4 cm from the upper or lower edge (widthwise) leads to the loss of having been taken possession of formally. That means that holes within the first 22 cm from the right or left edges of these robes, and 14.4 cm from the upper or lower edges of the robes are ineffective. But everything inside those fringes is effective.

198 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture* 〈97〉

not remain an extra robe,¹ there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture; the meaning is: this robe is to be forfeited (*nissaggiyam*) and his offence requires expiation (*pācittiyanam*). 〈97〉 Alternatively, forfeiture (*nissaggiyam*) is forfeiting (*nissajjanam*); this is the name of a disciplinary procedure that is to be done in the first place. There is something of his to be forfeited (*nissaggiyam*), thus it is indeed to be forfeited by him who has the [object] to be forfeited.²

How is it an act of expiation? Here the meaning is that for him, exceeding that [limit], expiation is a formal legal act together with forfeiture.^{-k}

And whatever day ^a—that robe has accrued, the dawn of that [day] is connected to the day of [its] accrual; therefore, at the eleventh dawn [if reckoned] together with it would be the tenth day after the day of the arising of the robe,^{-a} [That robe] has exceeded ten days. Having taken it, it is to be forfeited to (i) the Saṅgha, or (ii) to a group, or (iii) to an individual. This is the method there:

(i) To the Saṅgha it firstly (*tāva*) is to be forfeited as follows, “Venerable sirs, this robe, [which has] exceeded ten days, is to be forfeited by me. I forfeit this to the Saṅgha.” Having forfeited it, the offence is to be confessed as follows, “Venerable sirs, I have committed [an offence entailing] expiation with forfeiture. I confess it.”

^b—If there are two [robes], “two” must be said. If more than that, “many” must be said.^{-b} In the case of forfeiting, too, ^c—if there are two or many, it must be said, “Venerable sirs, these robes [which have] exceeded ten days are to be forfeited. I forfeit them to the Sangha.” By someone unable to say the correct text (*pālim*) it is to be said in some other manner.^{-c}

^d—The Saṅgha is to be informed by an experienced competent bhikkhu, “Venerable sirs, let the Saṅgha listen to me. This bhikkhu

^a—^aSp III 639,28ff.

^b—^bSp III 640,8f.

^c—^cSp III 640,10ff.

^d—^dSp III 640,15–19

¹ That is, for one not formally taking possession of or formally assigning the *atireka-cīvara* during that time period of ten days, because these actions would turn the *atireka-cīvara* into a regularly allowed *cīvara*.

² *saha-nissaggiyena* (Kkh 97,2), omitted in C^e and S^e (Kkh 97, n. 2); actually, this word is also not in Kkh B^e 56 (CSCD) or in the parallels in Sp III 639,20f., and Mūlas-ṭ 475,15f. Evidently, *saha-nissaggiyena* is a gloss that slipped into the text during its transmission.

⟨98⟩

Nissaggiyapācittiya 1 M

199

| so-and-so remembers his offence, reveals it, declares it, confesses it. If it
| is the appropriate time for the Saṅgha, I accept the [confession] of the
| bhikkhu so-and-so's offence.”^d By him (i.e. the accepting bhikkhu)
| accepting the offence with this accurate description, ^e[the bhikkhu con-
| fessing] is to be spoken to [in the following way], “Do you see [the
| offence]?”

| “Yes, I see it.”

| “You should restrain yourself in future.”

| “Good, I will restrain myself well.”

| In the case of two or more [offences], however, the change of words
| is to be made exactly according to the earlier method.^{1–e} [57]

| When the offence has been confessed, the forfeited robe is to be
| given [back] as follows, ^f“Venerable sirs, let the Saṅgha listen to me.
| This robe which had to be forfeited by the bhikkhu so-and-so is for-
| feited [by him] to the Saṅgha. If it is the appropriate time for the
| Saṅgha, ⟨98⟩ the Saṅgha should give [back] this robe to the bhikkhu so-
| and-so.”^f In the case of two or more [robes], the change of words is to
| be made [accordingly].

| (ii) By one forfeiting to a group, however, having said “I this”
| (*imāham*) or “I these” (*imāni aham*), “I forfeit to the venerable ones” is
| to be said; and also by the one who accepts the offence it is to be said,
| ^g“Let the venerable ones listen to me. This bhikkhu so-and-so remem-
| bers [his] offence … confesses [it]. If it is the appropriate time for the
| venerable ones …”. And at the giving [back] of the robe, too, it is to be
| said, “Let the venerable ones listen to me. This robe which had to be
| forfeited by the bhikkhu so-and-so, is forfeited [by him] to the venerable
| ones. If it is the appropriate time for the venerable ones, the venerable
| ones should give [back] this robe to the bhikkhu so-and-so.”^g The
| remainder is exactly the same as before.

| (iii) By one forfeiting to an individual, however, having said “I this”
| or “I these”, “I forfeit to the venerable one” is to be said. Having forfeited,
| the offence is to be confessed as follows, “Venerable sir (*bhante*), I have
| committed one [offence entailing] expiation with forfeiture. This I

^{e–e}Sp III 640,19–22

^{f–f}Vin III 196,31–34

^{g–g}Vin III 197,4–7

¹ See above, p. 174.

200 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture* 〈99〉

confess.” But if he is junior, he should say “friend” (*āvuso*). If he is spoken to “Have you seen” (*passi*) or “Have you seen” (*passatha*), he, too, after having said “Yes, sir (*bhante*)” or “Yes, friend (*āvuso*)” should say, “I see [it].”

Then spoken to with the words “In future, you (singular) should restrain yourself (*saṃvareyyāsi*)” or “You (plural) should restrain yourselves” (*saṃvareyyātha*), it should be said [by him or each of them], “Good, I will restrain myself well.” When the offence has thus been confessed, the robe is to be given [back with the words], “I give this robe to the venerable one.” In the case of two or three [bhikkhus] the method is to be understood exactly in accordance with what was said previously. But by two [bhikkhus], the robe] is to be forfeited in the same way as by a group. Thereafter the acceptance of the offence and the giving [back] of the forfeited robe is to be done by one or other of them (i.e. of the two) as by one individual.

This, however, is the procedure in respect of all forfeitures. For, only the mere object is different: robe, bowl, sitting [cloth]. But an absent thing is to be forfeited with the word “that” (*etam*). If there are many things, “those” (*etāni*) is to be said. In respect of giving [back] the forfeited things, too, exactly this is the method.

There is [an offence of] wrong doing for one who does not give back the forfeited object, with the thought, “This was given to me by him.” One knowing the fact that it is this [bhikkhu’s] property, [but] taking it away by a pretext, is to be dealt with having valued the good because of the owner’s giving up the legal claim.¹ 〈99〉

[This rule] was prescribed at Vesāli (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter of wearing extra robes (= 3. *subject matter*).

“For ten days at the most” (Pāt 29.6; Kkh 93.26) is the supplementary prescription (*amupaññatti*) here (i.e. in Niss 1 M). [The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

¹ In this way this type of taking away is qualified as the fifteenth type of theft, see above, p. 101.

There is [an offence of] wrong doing for one wearing (or using) it without having forfeited it [first]. And as here, so everywhere, therefore we shall not speak about it afterwards.¹ There is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking that [the robe material] had exceeded ten days even when it had not exceeded [them], and for one who is in doubt. There is [an offence entailing] expiation with forfeiture for one thinking it had not exceeded [ten days] when it had exceeded [them] and also for one who is in doubt. Similarly, for one thinking that it had been formally taken possession of, etc., when it had not been formally taken possession of, not formally assigned, not given away, not lost, not destroyed, not burned, not stolen (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence if within ten days [the robe material] has been formally taken possession of, formally assigned, given away, lost, destroyed, burnt, stolen, taken on trust, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

[The offence against this rule] is a failure in [right] behaviour (*ācāra-vipatti*). And as this, so also others after this, for in both Pātimokkhas the [offences entailing] defeat and [the offences entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha are [classified as being] failures in virtuous conduct. The remaining offences are [classified as being] failures in [right] behaviour. There is not one offence [that is classified as] a failure in [right] livelihood (*ājīva-vipatti*) or a failure in [right] views (*dīṭṭhi-vipatti*). But because of a failure in [right] livelihood [58] — except for wrong speech — six classes of offences are prescribed.² Because of a failure in [right] views (*dīṭṭhi-vipatti*), two classes of offences are prescribed by virtue of [offences entailing] expiation and [offences of] wrong doing.³ This is the distinction here. Thus discussion about failures is finished just here. We shall not examine it after this⁴ (= 8. failure).

¹ This is one of the author's guidelines for the usage of the text.

² The commentary (Kkh-nṭ 287,11–25) here refers to the *Parivāra* where the six types of offences one falls into because of a failure in [right] livelihood are listed (Vin V 99,5ff., BD VI 144), namely Pār 4 M (*pārājika, thullaccaya*), Sgh 5 M, Pāc 39 M, Pāt 1–8 N, Sekh 37 (*dukkhaṭa*).

³ Pāc 68 M (*dukkhaṭa, saṅghādisesa*), see Vin V 98,31–99,4 (BD VI 143f.).

⁴ The author means that for the rules to come he will no longer mention this category.

202 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture* (100)

These are the five constituent factors here: (i) a robe of the [described] quality and size being one's own property, (ii) being the subject of the counting [of the days], (iii) the state of having cut off the impediments, (iv) the state of an extra robe, (v) exceeding ten days (= 9. constituent factors).

The [offence against this rule has the] origin [called] *kathina* (*kaṭhina-samuṭṭhāna*)¹ (= 10. [sorts of] origin),
 [it originates in] inactivity (= 11. inactivity),
 [has] no acquittal due to [lacking] awareness (= 12. awareness),
 [is] not [dependent on] intention (= 13. intention),
 [is] a fault according to a precept [laid down by the Buddha] (= 14. fault),
 [is] a physical deed, a verbal deed (= 15. deeds),
 [is done with] three [types of] thought (= 16. thoughts),
 [with] three [types of] feeling (= 17. feelings).

The commentary on the rule about *kathina* is finished. (100)

[2. The commentary on the storehouse rule]

[2. Niss M: *The robe material having been settled for a bhikkhu, the kathina having been removed*,² if any bhikkhu should live apart from the three robes, even for one night, unless [it is] with the permission of the bhikkhus, there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture.

(Pāt 28,10ff. = Vin III 199,24ff.)]

In the second [rule] h—*The robe material having been settled for a bhikkhu (niṭṭhitacīvaraśmī bhikkhunā*, Pāt 28,10) — not taking the meaning here as in the first rule (i.e. Niss 1 M) — the meaning of the instrumental is to be understood by virtue of the genitive, as follows, “robe material having been settled for a bhikkhu”. For, by virtue of the instrumental “this action indeed has to be done by the bhikkhu”, [but]

^h—Sp III 651,30–52,3

¹ There are altogether thirteen possible combinations of origins of offences. These are named after the first offence considered to arise in that particular way. The *kaṭhina* origin (*kaṭhina-samuṭṭhāna*) is the one that appears for the first time in Niss 1 M, and thus is named after this rule. An offence with this origin may arise from body and thought or from body, speech, and thought. For the system and for details, see von Hinüber 1992a: 61.

² ubbhatasmī *kathine*, see Appendix 21.

|there is no [such action]. But by virtue of the genitive, (i.e.) “the robe
|material having been settled for the bhikkhu, and the *kathina* having
|been removed^{1-h} for the bhikkhu”,² thus i—the impediment is removed
|by the settling of the material and the removal of the *kathina*. Thus the
|meaning fits [with the words] “If any bhikkhu should live apart from the
|three robes, even for one night (ekarattam pi ce bhikkhu ticīvarena
|vippavaseyya, Pāt 28,10f.).³

|There, *From the three robes* (*ti-cīvarena*, Pāt 28,11) means: from one
|or other among the outer robe, etc., having been formally taken posses-
|sion of by the method of formally taking possession of the three robes.⁴⁻ⁱ

|j—*Should live apart from* (*vippavaseyya*, Pāt 28,11) means: should
|dwell separated from. Having deposited [the robe] in one or other of the
|fifteen places [suitable for] depositing [robes]⁵ divided into (1) village
|(gāma),^j (2) market town (*nigama*),⁶ (3) dwelling (*nivesana*), (4) storehouse

i—iSp III 652,2f. j—jSp III 652,8f.

¹ Two elements prevent the removal of the *kathina* period for a bhikkhu: his need for robes subsumed under the term “robe impediment” (*cīvara-pali-bodha*) and his relation to the residence within which the *kathina* period has been opened, summarized by the term “residence impediment” (*āvāsa-pali-bodha*). Having settled the robe matters, the robe impediment is removed for a bhikkhu because his entitlement to a share of robes accruing to the Saṅgha is fulfilled. Thus, removal of the *kathina* for a bhikkhu — the second element here — refers to a bhikkhu’s cutting his relation to his residence, either because he himself decides to leave the residence and to not return, or because the *kathina* period is simply over for the entire Saṅgha.

² *bhikkhuno* is to be linked with both members.

³ During the *kathina* period, that is, as long as the robes and residence impediments are not cut, it would not be an offence to be apart from the three robes. Therefore, being apart from the three robes can be an offence only outside the *kathina* period.

⁴ Only then do the rules Niss 1 to 3 M apply to the three robes (*ti-cīvara*). If the cloths used as the three robes are taken possession of formally as a requisite cloth, these rules do not apply to them.

⁵ Vin III 200,5–13 lists fifteen places. The list slightly deviates from the one in Kkh, since Kkh lists *nigama*, not noted in Vin (*nigama* and *nagara* are usually considered as being included in *gāma**), but instead reads the two *aṭṭa* “watch-tower” and *māla* “pavilion” as one word *aṭṭamāla*.

⁶ *gāma* and *nigama* are here understood as two elements of a dvandva. In this manner it is used everywhere in the later canonical literature. As shown by

204 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture*⟨101⟩

(*udosita*), (4) watchtower (*atṭa-māla*), (5) palace (*pāsāda*), (6) mansion (*hammiya*), (8) boat (*nāvā*), (9) caravan (*sattha*), (10) field (*khetta*), (11) threshing floor (*dhañña-karana*), (12) garden (*ārāma*), (13) *vihāra*,¹ (14) root of a tree, [and] (15) open places, mentioned in the text (that is, the Vinaya) according to the manner, ^k—“A village with one precinct, with various precincts”,^{–k} etc., [if] outside those villages, etc., having transgressed [the distance of] an arm’s reach (*hattha-pāsa**) [from his robe], he should wait until sunrise.² This is a summary here. But a detailed [regulation] is stated in the *Samantapāsādikā*.

Unless [it is] with the permission of the bhikkhus (aññatra bhikkhu-sammutiyā, Pāt 28,11f.) means: whatever permission the Saṅgha gives to a bhikkhu who is ill for living apart with regard to [his] three robes, except for that. It is to be understood that for a bhikkhu who has not received permission who lives apart for even one night, [an offence entailing] expiation with forfeiture [arises] in exactly the stated manner. Only here there is a change of words in the manner, ^a—“I stayed away from the robe (or: the set of three robes), venerable sirs,³ for one night, without the permission of the bhikkhus. It is to be forfeited by me” ^{–a}

⟨101⟩ This, however, is the difference.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning many bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter of going forth on a journey through the country with [only] an upper [robe] and a lower robe (= 3. *subject matter*).

This, [i.e.] “unless [it is] with the agreement of the bhikkhus” (*aññatra bhikkhu-sammutiyā*, Pāt 28,11f.), is the supplementary prescription (*anupaññatti*) here (i.e. in Niss 2 M). [The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

^{k–k}Vin III 200,5 ^{a–a}Vin III 199,37–200,2

von Hinüber (2016: 307) this actually is a misunderstood meaning of *gāmā-nigama* which originally meant “settling of a trek”, a meaning still preserved in the *Ghaṭikārasuttanta* (M II 53,13).

¹ *vihāra* here can mean a dwelling place for a single bhikkhu, several bhikkhus, or a monastery.

² Literally, “he should cause the sun to rise”, that is, should spend the night.

³ Literally, “This robe, venerable sirs, was away from me”.

There is [an offence of] wrong doing for one who thinks he has lived apart when he has not lived apart and for one who is in doubt. There is [an offence entailing] expiation with forfeiture for one who thinks he has lived apart when he has lived apart, and for one who thinks he has not lived apart and for one who is in doubt; similarly, for one who thinks it has been formally given up (*paccuddhaṭa*), given away (*vissajjita*), etc., when it has not been formally given up, given away, etc. (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

But there is no offence with respect to [a robe] formally given up before dawn and with respect to the sorts of [robes] given away, etc., as stated in the first *kathina* [rule];¹ similarly, in the case of living apart for one who has received permission. [59] But when the illness has abated [the bhikkhu] must return, or if he remains in that very place [the robe] must be formally given up [by him].² Or else, if he is again inflicted by this or another illness, the [permission that] has been obtained remains valid.³ (= 7. non-offence).

These are the four constituent factors here: (i) the robe having been formally taken possession of, (ii) the *kathina* [robe] not having been stretched out (i.e. the *kathina* period not having been opened), (iii) being without having obtained permission, (iv) living apart overnight (= 9. constituent factors).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc.,⁴ are exactly of the type stated for the first *kathina* rule (Niss 1 M).

Only there, not formally taking possession of and not assigning are inactivity (*akiriyā*), [whereas] here not formally giving up [of the robe is inactivity], this is the difference (= 11. activity).

The commentary on the storehouse rule is finished.

¹ This refers to the list in Kkh 99,10f., in the *anāpatti* section of the classification of Niss 1 M.

² In case the illness has abated, the bhikkhu is able to return to the place where he deposited his robe, and in that way can end living away from his robe. But if the bhikkhu remains where he was during his illness, which means that he still is separated from his robe deposited elsewhere, then he has to formally give up the robe because the allowance to live away from it ceases with the end of his illness.

³ As the commentary explains, it is not necessary to grant him the allowance again in connection with being away from his robes (Kkh-nt 292,19f.).

⁴ For the remaining classification categories see above, pp. 81ff.

206 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture* (102)

[3. The commentary on the rule about untimely robe material]
 [3. Niss M: *The robe material having been settled for a bhikkhu, the kathina having been removed,¹ should untimely robe [material] accrue to a bhikkhu, it is to be formally accepted by the bhikkhu if he wishes. Having formally accepted it, it is to be made up quickly. But should it not be sufficient for him, that robe material is to be deposited by that bhikkhu for a month at most, there being expectation that the deficiency may be supplied. If he should deposit it for longer than that, even with there being expectation, there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture.*

(Pāt 28,15–21 = Vin III 203,32–38)]

In the third [rule], *The robe material having been settled for a bhikkhu (niṭṭhitacīvaraśmī bhikkhunā, Pāt 28,15)* the meaning of the instrumental is to be understood indeed by virtue of the genitive.

Untimely robe [material] (*akālacakīvaraṁ*, Pāt 28,16)² means: whichever time [for giving] robes is stated to be^b—“the last month of the rains when the *kathina* [robe] has not been spread out,³ or five months when the *kathina* [robe] has been spread out”,^{4–b} except for that, [robe material] (102) accrued at another time, and whatever is given in the following manner to the Saṅgha, even at the right time, [with the words,] “This is untimely robe [material]”, or to an individual with the words, “I give this to you”, this is untimely robe [material].

Should accrue (uppajjeyya, Pāt 28,16) means: robe [material] of such a sort should accrue by virtue of receiving one’s own share from the Saṅgha or from a group such as the Suttantikas (“those versed in the discourses”), etc.,^c or from a relative or from a friend or as a dustheap robe or with one’s own resources^c or through one or other in the list of eight [ways stated in the Vinaya]:^d—“There are, bhikkhus, this list of eight [ways] for accruing robe material:

^{b–b}Vin III 261,36f. ^{c–c}Vin III 204,6f. ^{d–d}Vin I 309,22–25

¹ *ubbhatasmīm kathine*, see Appendix 21.

² This includes robe material given outside the appointed time for giving robes or material given during the appointed time to a specific bhikkhu or group of bhikkhus (see DOP s.v. *kāla*).

³ That is, when a Saṅgha did not open the *kathina* period.

⁴ That is, when the *kathina* period has been opened. Since this period lasts for four months, there are then altogether five months for receiving robes.

- (1) he gives to a boundary;
- (2) he gives in accordance with an agreement;¹
- (3) he gives with an announcement of alms food;
- (4) he gives to a Saṅgha;
- (5) he gives to both Saṅghas;
- (6) he gives to a Saṅgha which has spent the rains;
- (7) he gives specifying [the recipients];
- (8) he gives to an individual.”^{–d}

And here (1) “he gives to a boundary” (*sīmāya deti*, Kh 102,7) means: giving by [verbally] touching the boundary as follows, “I give to a boundary.” The same method [is valid] everywhere. And here “boundary” means the fifteen sorts of boundary:

- (1.1) ^ethe boundary for a part [of a community] (*khaṇḍa-sīmā*),
- (1.2) the precinct boundary (*upacāra-sīmā*),
- (1.3) the boundary for the same communion (*saṃāna-samvāsa-sīmā*),
- (1.4) the boundary for the [condition of] not being separated [from the three robes] (*avippavāsa-sīmā**),
- (1.5) the benefits boundary² (*lābha-sīmā*),
- (1.6) the village boundary (*gāma-sīmā**),
- (1.7) the market town boundary (*nigama-sīmā**),
- (1.8) the city boundary (*nagara-sīmā**),
- (1.9) the boundary [consisting in seven] *abbhantaras** (about 85 m) (*abbhantara-sīmā*),
- (1.10) the boundary [established by] throwing water (*udakukkhepa-sīmā**),
- (1.11) the country boundary (*janapada-sīmā*),
- (1.12) the kingdom boundary (*raṭṭha-sīmā*),
- (1.13) the royal boundary (*rajja-sīmā*),
- (1.14) the island boundary (*dīpa-sīmā*),

^e–^eSp V 1136.8–19

¹ *katikāya deti*; according to Sp V 1138,13ff. what is meant here is an agreement concerning income held in common (*saṃāna-lābha-katikā*), defining which vihāras receive portions of what is given. See Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 145ff.

² Other possible translations are “income boundary” or “gains boundary”.

208 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture*⟨103⟩

(1.15) the mountain range boundary (*cakkavāla-sīmā*).

There (1.2) the “precinct boundary” (*upacārasīmā*, Kkh 102,12f.) of an enclosed *vihāra* is determined by the enclosure (*parikkhepa*), [that] of an unenclosed [*vihāra*] by the place suitable for an enclosure. Moreover, the precinct boundary is to be understood as inside two throws of a clod of earth by a man of medium strength from the place where the bhikkhus regularly congregate or from the eating hall standing at the edge or from the dwelling place for regular dwellers. It (the boundary) increases as the residence (*āvāsa**) increases.^e It decreases as [the residence] decreases. Even [if it is] one hundred leagues (*yojana**; about 1,120 or 1,280 km) in size, it remains a “precinct boundary”.

The benefits given there (i.e. to the precinct boundary) reach all who are inside the boundary. The bhikkhunīs’ entry into the [bhikkhus’] monastery, the questions for lodgings, the announcing of probation and *mānatta* penance, and the arrangements for breaking the rains [retreat] and obtaining the requisites and lodgings, etc. — all of this is to be understood by virtue of this boundary only. ⟨103⟩

(1.5) “Benefits boundary” (*lābha-sīmā*, Kkh 102,13) means: whatever ^f*vihāra* kings or kings’ ministers, etc., have had built, [and] whatever [boundary] they have defined all around, [be it at a distance of] a *gāvuta** or half a league (*yojana**) or a league, [this] they determine [with the words,] “This is the benefits boundary of our *vihāra*. Whatever [60] accrues inside this space, all this we give to our *vihāra*.” This is a benefits boundary.^f

(1.11)^g But inside the kingdoms of Kāsi, Kosala, etc., there are many countries. There, the exact determination (*pariccheda*) of one country is “a country boundary” (*janapada-sīmā*, Kkh 102,14f.).

(1.12) The exact determination of a kingdom such as Kāsi or Kosala is “a kingdom’s boundary”^g (*rattha-sīmā*, Kkh 102,15).

(1.13)^h The region where a king exercises authority is “a royal boundary”^h (*raja-sīmā*, Kkh 102,15).

(1.14)ⁱ A large island enclosed by the sea or an island in a river¹ is “an island boundary”ⁱ (*dīpa-sīmā*, Kkh 102,15).

^{f-f}Sp V 1136,27-33 ^{g-g}Sp V 1136,33-37,2 ^{h-h}Sp V 1137,3f. ⁱ⁻ⁱSp V 1137,4f.

¹ Literally “an island within” (*antara-dīpa*).

(1.15) Inside the enclosure of one mountain range is “a mountain-range boundary” (*cakkavāla-sīmā*, Kkh 102,15). The remaining [boundaries] are in fact of the manner stated in the introduction discourse.¹

(1.1) There, something given [with the words,] “I give to the ‘boundary for a part [of the community]’ (*khanda-sīmā*)” goes only to those who are inside the “boundary for a part [of the community]”. It does not reach [those] outside that boundary, not even those who are inside the interval between boundaries (*sīmantarikā*).

(1.2) ^j–But something given [with the words,] “We give this to the precinct boundary (*upacāra-sīmā**)”, goes even to those who are inside the “boundary for a part [of the community] (*khanda-sīmā**)” and in the interval between boundaries (*sīmantarikā*) inside the exact determination [of the precinct boundary].

(1.3) Something given to the “boundary for the same communion” (*samāna-saṃvāsa-sīmā**) does not reach those who are inside the “boundary for a part [of a community]” (*khanda-sīmā**) and in the interval between boundaries (*sīmantarikā*).

(1.4–5) Something given to the “boundary for the [condition of] not being separated [from the three robes]” (*avippavāsa-sīmā**) and the “benefits boundary” (*lābha-sīmā*) goes only to those who are inside them.

(1.6–8) Something given to the village boundary (*gāma-sīmā*), etc., goes even to those who are inside the determined boundaries (*baddha-sīmā**) inside those [village] boundaries, [etc.].

(1.9–10) Something given to the “seven *abbhantara* boundary” (*sattabhbhantara-sīmā**) and the “boundary [established by] throwing water” (*udakukkhepa-sīmā**) goes only to those who are inside them.^j

(1.11–15) Something given² to country boundaries (*janapada-sīmā*), etc., goes even to those in “determined boundaries” inside these [country boundaries]. Therefore, whatever is given by someone ^k–who stays in Jambudīpa (i.e. in India) [with the words,] “We give this to the Saṅgha

^j–^j ≠ Sp V 1137,13–21

^k–^k ≠ Sp V 1137,23–26

¹ See above, pp. 23ff., 207f.

² Kkh 103,20 reads *dinnam pi*, mentioning that Po omits this *pi* (n. 9). In analogy to the other cases given, the *pi* should be dismissed here. This the more so since it collides with the second *pi* after *baddha-sīmatṭhānam*. The latter is indispensable, and similarly used in the preceding sentence referring to villages.

210 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture*⟨104⟩

in the island of Tambapāṇī (i.e. present day Sri Lanka)”, even a single person having travelled from the island of Tambapāṇī is allowed to take this for all. Even if in that very place one “bhikkhu of the same fraction” (*sabhāgo bhikkhu*)¹ takes the share of the “[bhikkhus] of the same fraction”, he is not to be restrained.^{-k}

But whoever, entering a *vihāra*, only says, “I give to the boundary”, without saying “to such-and-such a boundary”, ^ahe is to be asked, “There are many boundaries. Which one are you talking about?” If he says, “I do not know the difference, let the Saṅgha being inside the boundary take it”, ^ait is to be shared by those who are in the precinct boundary. ⟨104⟩

(2) “According to agreement” (*katikāya*, Kkh 102,7) means: here, agreement means the agreement about common benefits. This is, however, ^bto be made thus: By the bhikkhus gathered together in one *vihāra*, whatever [other] *vihāra* they wish to make one [partaking in] common benefits,² desiring to favour [it], taking the name of that, saying some cause or other [as for example], “Such-and-such a *vihāra* is old, has few benefits”, it is to be announced three times, “It pleases the Saṅgha to make that *vihāra* one [partaking in] common benefits together with this *vihāra*.³ To such an extent, even one seated in that *vihāra* is in fact seated here [in this *vihāra*]. In that *vihāra*, too, it is to be carried through in exactly the same way.⁴ To such an extent, even one seated here [in this *vihāra*] is in fact seated in that [*vihāra*.⁵ When benefits are being

^{a-a} ≠ Sp V 1137,31–38,2 ^{b-b} ≠ Sp V 1138,15–24

¹ *sabhāga*, literally “having the same share”, “being of the same fraction”, refers to bhikkhus that belong to the same fraction within a Saṅgha (see also Kieffer-Pülz 2013: III [Z 298], n. 9). In the present case this example shows that a single bhikkhu of the same fraction may take something for the entire fraction, just as one bhikkhu from Tambapāṇī may take something given for all the bhikkhus in Tambapāṇī.

² That is, which specific *vihāra* they want to receive an equal share.

³ This is an agreement *katikā*, or more specifically, a monastic organizational guideline. For such agreements, see Ratnapala 1971; Jansen 2015.

⁴ This means that the same procedure of announcing the agreement has to be carried out in the other *vihāra*.

⁵ If such an agreement exists, it does not matter in which of the two monasteries a bhikkhu stays; he will receive an equal share of what comes into each of these two monasteries.

⟨104⟩

Nissaggiyapācittiya 3 M

211

divided in one *vihāra*, it is suitable for one being in the other [*vihāra*] to receive a share.^{-b}

(3) “With an announcement of alms food” (*bhikkhāpaññattiya*, ≠ Kkh 102,7), here, announcement of alms food means: the place of the announcement of the distribution of the giver. ^cTherefore, [if] it has been said [by the donor,] “Where my constant services are carried out, there I give” or “You (pl.) [should] give there”^{-c} or where his cooking service is taking place or whence he constantly feeds bhikkhus or where some lodging has been made by him — it is given everywhere. But if [61] in one place of constant services there are fewer bhikkhus or only a single piece of cloth, [then by the bhikkhus] having laid bare the channel [for the accruing of requisites],¹ it is to be accepted in such manner as [the donor] says.

(4) ^d—“He gives for the Saṅgha” (*saṅghassa deti*, Kkh 102,8): here what is given [by him,] entering the *vihāra* with the words, “I give to the Saṅgha”,^{-d} [that] goes to those who are within the precinct boundary and those who are joined together with them, even if they are outside that [precinct boundary]. Therefore, there being a receiver, a share is to be given even to those who have not arrived. But whatever is given “to the Saṅgha” [by one] who has seen the bhikkhus outside the precinct boundary, that goes to the assembly joined together. But it does not reach those who have not arrived within twelve cubits (*hattha*^{*}) lengths of the assembly (i.e., within approximately five metres).

^{c-d} ≠ Sp V 1138,33–35 ^{d-d} ≠ Sp V 1139,15f.

¹ Compare Sp VI 1260,13–17: *ganthadhutaṅgādīhi pana anabhiññāto āvāsikabhikkhu pucchitum labhati. tasmā tena “kim saṅghato gaṇhāmi udāhu ye jānāmi, tehi saddhiṃ ḣāgacchāmī” ti mātikam āropetvā yathā dāyakā vadanti, tathā paṭipajjitatthaṁ*. “But a resident bhikkhu undistinguished by studies, ascetic practices, etc., may ask. Therefore, by his having laid bare the channel [of the accruing of requisites], ‘Shall I take from the Saṅgha or shall I come together with those whom I know’, the line of action has to be taken in such manner as the donors say.” Vmv II 250,11ff.: **mātikam āropetvā ti** (Sp VI 1261,16) “saṅghato gaṇhāmī” ti ādinā vuttamātikābhedam dāyakassa viññāpetvā ti attho. **“Having laid bare the channel [for the accruing of the requisites]**, the meaning is: having informed the donor about the types of channels [of the accruing of requisites] as stated [with the sentence] beginning with ‘I take from the Saṅgha’.”

212 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture* (105)

(5) “To both Saṅghas” (*ubhatosaṅghassa*, Kkh 102,8), here, however, whatever is given to both Saṅghas, half of that is to be given to the bhikkhus, half to the bhikkhunīs. If there is only one bhikkhu or one bhikkhunī, half indeed (namely the half intended for the absent monastic of the other sex) is to be given even to one who has not been ordained.¹

^e—But it having been said, “to both Saṅghas and to you”, if there are ten bhikkhus and ten bhikkhunīs, making it into twenty-one parts, one part is to be given to the individual, ten to the Bhikkhu Saṅgha and ten to the Bhikkhunī (105) Saṅgha.

The one who has obtained the individual part is allowed to receive [a share]² also from the Saṅgha in accordance with his years [since ordination]. Why? Because of it being received by [means of] receiving by both Saṅghas. When it is said “to both Saṅghas and the *cetiya*”³ it is exactly the same method. But here there is no share that goes to the *cetiya* from the Saṅgha; there is one share similar to the share obtained by the one individual.^{4—e}

^f—But when it is said “to the Bhikkhu Saṅgha and the Bhikkhunīs” it is not to be given cutting it in the middle, [rather] it is to be given having counted the bhikkhus and the bhikkhunīs. When it is said “to the Bhikkhu Saṅgha and the Bhikkhunīs and to you”, the individual does not receive a separate [portion]. He receives only one part from the share reaching [all].^f But when it is said “and to the *cetiya*”, ^g—one individual share is obtained for the *cetiya*.^{—g}

^{e—e}Sp V 1141,27—42,1

^{f—f}Sp V 1142,6—10

^{g—g}Sp V 1142,12f.

¹ Kkh 104,25 reads *anupasampannassā pi*; the long °ā looking as if a feminine form results from the fusion with *api*. The °assāpi has been separated into °assā pi (which is the standard way the present Kkh edition renders combinations with *api/pi*). Thus, it is a masculine form. Compare the parallel in Sp-t III 344,21f. with the reading *anupasampannassapi*.

² What is meant is his share which he has to obtain from the Saṅgha, since he receives one part as an individual and one part from the ten parts given to the Saṅgha of which he is a member.

³ *cetiya* may be a “shrine” in general, but it more specifically stands for a funeral monument or *thūpa*, that is, a place of veneration connected with a Buddha (see DOP s.v.). For details, see Appendix 24.

⁴ Just as in the example where goods are given “to both Saṅghas and you”, and where one share for the individual is put aside, here, a share for the *cetiya* is put aside. Since the *cetiya* is not a member of the Saṅgha, it does not receive an additional share from the Saṅgha.

⟨106⟩*Nissaggiyapācittiya 3 M*

213

^h—Even when it is said “to the bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs”, it is not to be given cutting it in the middle; it is to be shared only by counting the individuals; ^h grasping (lit. touching) an individual and a *cetiya* together with them is exactly the same method as that immediately preceding.
ⁱ—And as the method is applied starting with the Bhikkhu Saṅgha, so it is to be applied starting with the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha. When it is said “to the Bhikkhu Saṅgha and to you”, a separate [share] is not obtained by the individual;ⁱ but it is obtained by the *cetiya*,^j and when it is said “to the bhikkhus and to you”, a separate [share] is not obtained [by the individual],^j but it is obtained indeed by the *cetiya*.

(6) “To the Saṅgha which has kept the rains” (*vassam vutthasaṅghassa*, Kkh 102,8): here, if entering the vihāra he says, “I give to the Saṅgha which has kept the rains”, all those there who have kept the earlier rains [retreat] without breaking the rains [retreat], it goes to them, even if they are outside the boundary, not to others. But if standing outside the precinct boundary he says “to the Saṅgha which has kept the rains”, ^kit goes to all who are present wherever they have kept the rains. Or if he says “to [the Saṅgha which has] kept the rains in such-and-such a vihāra”, then it goes only to those who have kept the rains there up to the removal of the *kaṭhina*.² [If] he speaks thus from the first day of summer, it goes to all who are [present] face to face there,^k not to others.

(7) ^a—“He gives specifying [the recipients]” (*ādissa deti*, Kkh 102,9) means: having specified (alternative form) having defined (alternative verb) he gives.^a How? ^bHaving invited bhikkhus [62] for rice gruel for that day or the next day, having caused them to drink rice gruel in [his] house ⟨106⟩ he says, “I give these robes to those by whom my rice gruel was drunk”; it goes only to those by whom, being invited, the rice gruel was drunk.^b For those invited for food, hard, etc.,³ it is exactly the same method.

^{h-h}Sp V 1142,15ff.ⁱ⁻ⁱSp V 1142,22-25^{j-j}Sp V 1142,29f.^{k-k}Sp V 1143,32-44,2^{a-a}Sp V 1144,26^{b-b}Sp V 1144,28-32

¹ Since the *cetiya* is not part of the Saṅgha, it does not receive a share of the Saṅgha property. Therefore, it has to receive a separate share if it is mentioned among the recipients.

² That is, up to the end of the *kathina* period in that residence.

³ *bhutta-khajjakādhi*; *khajjaka*, alternatively *khādanīya*, stands for “hard” or

214 Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture (106)

(8) ^c—“He gives to an individual” (*puggalassa deti*, Kkh 102,9) means: [saying,] “I give this robe to so-and-so”, [he gives] thus in his absence, or putting it at his feet with the words “This is for you”, he gives thus in his presence.^c

This is a brief explanation. But a detailed [regulation] is stated in the Samantapāsādikā.¹ Thus, whatever is received with the characteristic of an untimely robe [material] by virtue of this list of eight [ways], with reference to that, “should accrue as untimely robe [material]” is stated.

If he wishes (ākaṇkhamānenā, Pāt 28,16f.) means: if he desires.

Is to be made up quickly (khippam eva kāretabbam, Pāt 28,17f.) means: is to be made speedily within just ten days.

^d—*If it should not be sufficient (no c' assa pāripūrī, Pāt 28,18)* means: if it should not be sufficient (*no ce pāripūrī bhaveyya*; alternative form). The robe material would not be that size according to which it would suffice as a basis for a robe² being made; the meaning is, it would be smaller.^d

There being expectation (satiyā paccasāya, Pāt 28,20) means: there being expectation of a robe in this manner, ^e—“On such-and-such a day the Saṅgha will obtain robes; from that a robe will occur for me”; ^e or in this [manner,] “From some place or other among the Saṅgha, a group, relatives or friends, or as a dusheap robe I shall obtain [a robe]”; or thus, “I shall receive a robe [in exchange for] lawful goods.”

^c—^cSp V 1145,17–20

^d—^dSp III 658,22–25

^e—^e≠ Sp III 658,25–27

“solid food”, the “etc.” refers to “soft food” (*bhojanīya*). Other translations for these terms are “non-staple” and “staple food” (Thānissaro 2007: I 370–374, with long lists of the food belonging to the one or other category); “side dishes” and “main dishes” or “staple food” (Inoue 2007–2008: 1246), or “uncooked” and “cooked food” (Ñāṇatissa 2014: 203). Since, as stated by Thānissaro, what is staple food now, is not identical with what was staple food at the time of the Buddha or in subsequent centuries, we here stick to the translation “solid” and “soft food”. Since these terms are not common in contemporary English with reference to types of food, their usage does not imply the danger that ideas about present day food are transferred to these early texts.

¹ Sp V 1145,17–27.

² Kkh 106,13 *adhitṭhāna-cīvaraṃ* with the Burmese tradition; C^e reads *adhitṭhānam* *cīvaraṃ*. So also Khuddas-nṭ Be 358,5f. Since there does not exist an *adhitṭhāna-cīvara*, and since in reading the compound an object for *pahoti* is missing, the words have to be written separately as in C^e.

⟨107⟩*Nissaggiyapācittiya 3 M*

215

If for longer than that (*tato ce uttari*, Pāt 28,20):^f the meaning is, if he should deposit it for more than a month at the most, it is to be forfeited.^{f g} But if his original robe is [worn] thin, [and] the expected robe [material] is thick, it is not possible to join them; and if there are nights remaining and the month is not yet complete, the robe is not to be made against his will. Only having obtained another expected robe [material], is it to be made in the intervening time. If he does not obtain [another expected robe material] the [received] expected robe too is to be formally taken possession of as a requisite cloth (*parikkhāra-cola*).¹

Or if the original robe is thick, [and] the expected robe is thin, having formally taken possession of the original robe as a requisite cloth (*parikkhāra-cola*), having made just that expected robe [take the place of] the original robe, it is to be deposited. This [original robe] again obtains a one-month protection. As long as he does not obtain it by this ⟨107⟩ means, for so long he is permitted to deposit another [robe] having made it [take the place of] the original robe^g For this method of forfeiting is to be understood after the manner of ^h“Venerable sirs, this untimely robe [material] exceeding one month is to be forfeited by me.”^h

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning many bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter of exceeding one month after having received untimely robe [material] (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

Beyond that, it is exactly the same as was stated in the first *kathina* rule (Niss 1 M), only there, it was “exceeding ten days”; here, it is “exceeding a month”. This is the difference. The remainder is exactly the same.

The commentary on the rule about untimely robe material is finished.

^{f-f}Sp III 659,4f. ^{g-g}# Sp III 659,12-21 ^{h-h}Vin III 205,2f.

¹ Since this material does not suffice to make a regular robe, the bhikkhu formally takes possession of it as a requisite cloth, since there are no restrictions as to number and size in that case. See above, p. 194. The “too” (*pi*) after “expected robe” indicates that not only the expected robe is to be formally taken possession of, but also the *mūla-cīvara*.

216 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture* (107)

[4. The commentary on the rule about old robes]

[4. Niss M: *If any bhikkhu should have an old robe washed or dyed or washed by beating by a bhikkhunī not related [to him], there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture.*

(Pāt 28,23–25 = Vin III 206,20ff.)]

In the fourth [rule, *By a bhikkhunī not related* (*aññātikāya*, Pāt 28,23)] means: by one not being a female relative (resolution of compound); the meaning is: by one unconnected in any way up to the seventh generation from the mother's [side], as well as from the father's [side].

By a bhikkhunī (*bhikkhuniyā*, Pāt 28,23) means: [63] by one who has been ordained in [the presence of] a mere Bhikkhu Saṅgha¹ like the Sākiya ladies, or in [the presence of] both Saṅghas.

An old robe (*purāṇacīvaraṁ*, Pāt 28,23) means: ⁱ-[a robe that] has been dyed, [to which] a legalizing dot has been applied,² even if it has been worn or put on only once,³ or whatever [robe] someone — even

ⁱ-i Sp III 660,20–24

¹ This includes women who have been ordained as males by bhikkhus and later underwent a sex change (*liṅga-parivattana*). They are ordained only by one side (*ekato upasampannā*), but — unlike the usual usage of this expression, which refers to women ordained by the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha — in this case it refers to a bhikkhunī (by sex change) ordained by a Bhikkhu Saṅgha. To that extent they are similar to the first women ordained as *bhikkhunīs*, the Sākiyan women who accompanied Mahāpajāpatī, with whom they are compared here, and who also received their ordination from a Bhikkhu Saṅgha. These nuns through a sex change are considered full-fledged nuns because ordination by bhikkhus is considered as being higher than ordination as bhikkhunīs if we follow Vmv I 154,22f., see Kieffer-Pülz 2018: 41, n. 57.¹ *kappam katvā* is used synonymously for *kappabindum datvā* (used for instance Kkh 94,15, above, p. 193, n. 1) according to the commentary (Kkh-nṭ 302,10: ***kappam katvā*** ti (Kkh 107,18) *kappabindum datvā*). For *kappa* = *kappabindu*, see also CPD 5*kappa*. For further discussions, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II 1001.

² *nivattham vā pārutanam vā*; *nivattha* is regularly used in connection with an inner robe, *pāruta* with an outer robe.

³ *nivattham vā pārutanam vā*; *nivattha* is regularly used in connection with an inner robe, *pāruta* with an outer robe.

⟨108⟩*Nissaggiyapācittiya 4 M*

217

|under the heading of use¹ — has put on his shoulder or his head [when]
|walking along a road, or has made a pillow [when] sleeping — this is an
|old robe.ⁱ

|Should have washed (*dhovāpeyya vā*, Pāt 28,24) means: if he says the
|word, “Wash it”,^j or makes a bodily gesture or puts it into her hand
|with his hand or places it at her feet^{j k} or standing within an area of
|twelve cubits (*hattha**) lengths (about five metres)^k [(i.e. away) at the
|maximun] throws it upwards or sends it [to her] in the hand of another,
|[and] it is washed by her, this is indeed “causing it to be washed”. In
|causing [it] to be dyed and “causing [it] to be washed by beating”, too, it
|is exactly the same method.

^a—[If] he gives it into the hand of a trainee, a female novice, or a
|female lay follower ⟨108⟩ to wash it, if she washes it after having been
|ordained, thus, too, there is [an offence entailing] expiation with for-
|feiture. [If] it is given into the hand of a male lay follower, or a male
|novice, if he, having changed his sex, washes it after having been
|ordained [it is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture]; or [if] it is
|given to a young bhikkhu, he too, having changed his sex, washes it,
>this indeed is [an offence entailing] expiation with forfeiture.^a In caus-
|ing [it] to be dyed and causing [it] to be washed by beating, too, it is
|exactly the same method. But the method of forfeiting is to be understood
|after the manner of ^b—“This old robe of mine, venerable sirs, [which I] had
|washed by a bhikkhunī who is not related, is to be forfeited”.^b

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning
|Elder Udāyi (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter of hav-
|ing an old robe washed (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is connected with commanding [someone else], because of the order
|beginning with “Wash” (= 5. *command*).

And in respect of all actions, such as preparing the oven, etc., of the
|bhikkhunī being ordered in this way, there is [an offence of] wrong
|doing for the bhikkhu. Having washed it, merely raised up, merely
|dyed, merely beaten, it is [an offence entailing] forfeiture. For one

^j—^jSp III 661,9f. ^k—^kSp III 661,13 ^a—^aSp III 661,15ff. ^b—^bVin III 206,34f.

¹ This comes under the heading of use because the robe touches the body
(Kkh-nt 302,11f.).

218 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture*(**108**)

causing all three [things], washing, etc., or two [things] to be done there is [an offence entailing] forfeiture because of one thing, [an offence of] wrong doing because of the others. But if spoken to with the word “Wash”, she does it all indeed, there is an offence because of the washing only. But for one saying, “Whatever is to be done in respect of this robe, do that”, because of the one utterance there are two [offences of] wrong doing with the expiation [offence]. There is [an offence of] wrong doing for one causing the washing to be done by a [bhikkhuni] ordained by one Saṅgha;¹ for one using it, not having forfeited [it]; for one causing something to be washed belonging to another or a spreading as a piece of cloth to sit upon of another; for one thinking she was not a relative when she was a relative; and for one who is in doubt. For one thinking she was a relative when she was not a relative, and for one who is in doubt, there is [an offence entailing] expiation with forfeiture. But from here on, in such instances [as the present one], we will say, “[There is a] triple [offence entailing] expiation.”² (= 6. [sorts of] offence.)

If a relative’s unrelated female friend [who was] not told to wash [it], washes [it], or washes an unused robe or another requisite [than a robe], or trainees or female novices wash [it], there is no offence. For one who is insane, etc., there is definitely no offence (= 7. non-offence).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) the state of being an old robe, (ii) the ordering of an unrelated bhikkhuni staying in the pre-cinct, (iii) her washing, etc. (= 9. constituent factors).

The [offence against this rule has the] origin of the [rule about] a go-between (Sgh 5 M) (= 10. [sorts of] origin),

- [it originates in] activity (= 11. activity),
- [has] no acquittal due to [lacking] awareness (= 12. awareness),
- [is] not [dependent on] intention (= 13. intention),
- [is] a fault according to a precept [laid down by the Buddha] (= 14. fault),
- [is] a physical deed, a verbal deed (= 15. deeds),
- [is done with] three [types of] thought (= 16. thoughts),

¹ This refers to women who only received ordination within the Bhikkhuni Saṅgha.

² This belongs to the guidelines for using Kkh, which the author gives from time to time. It means that from now on he will simply say, “There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation”, in the rules to come, but not explain the cases in detail. We add the relevant reference to the Vinaya in order to enable the reader to find the cases easily.

⟨109⟩*Nissaggiyapācittiya 5 M*

219

| ⟨109⟩ [with] three [types of] feeling (= 17. *feelings*).

| The commentary on the rule about old robes is finished.

| [5. The commentary on the rule about formally accepting robes]

| [5. Niss M: *If any bhikkhu should formally accept a robe from the hand of a bhikkhunī not related [to him], unless [it is] in exchange, there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture.*

| (Pāt 30,2f = Vin III 209,33ff.)]

| In the fifth [rule], this [by a bhikkhunī] *not related* (*aññatikāya*, Pāt 30,2) [is] exactly the same manner as stated [above] (i.e. in Niss 4 M, p. 228). Therefore, from here on out we will not consider [it] anywhere.¹

| *Robe* (*cīvaraṁ*, Pāt 30,2) means: one or other of the six [64] which are suitable for formal assignment. This method [applies] to all rules connected with robes. But where there is any difference, we will speak [of it] there.²

| *Should formally accept* (*paṭiggaṇheyya*, Pāt 30,3) means: here whether one gives by hand into the hand, or lays at the feet, or throws upwards, even having left the precinct,³ as clothes are being thrown to one who preaches a sermon on the Doctrine,⁴ if he (i.e. the one who preaches the Doctrine) consents, it is indeed formally accepted. But it is suitable to take [a robe] sent in the hand of someone or other who is not ordained; it is, in fact, suitable, to take a dustheap robe having formally taken possession of it, even if placed on a dustheap with the thought, “He (i.e. a bhikkhu) will take it”.⁵

| *Unless [it is] in exchange* (*aññatra pārivattakā*, Pāt 30,3) means: whatever he receives in exchange, having given even a piece of yellow

¹ Guideline of the author.

² Again, a guideline of the author.

³ As stated in the commentaries, the *upacāra*, consisting in twelve cubits (*hattha**), is irrelevant for Niss 5 M (Kkh-nt 303,25f.; Sp-t II 400,21–24), whereas in Niss 4 M it was a precondition that the bhikkhu who gives a used robe to a bhikkhunī for washing throws it to her from a distance of twelve cubits at most (Kkh 107,24, see above, p. 217).

⁴ This is one of the accepted methods to give something to a bhikkhu, see Sp III 664,2–5.

⁵ Such robes actually are not *pāṇsukūla* (“from a dustheap”) because they are old. They even might be quite new, but are purposely put on a dustheap in order that those who wear dustheap robe might take them.

220 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture*⟨110⟩

myrobalan or having formed the deliberate thought, “I will give”, except for that, for one taking anything else, even a water-strainer cloth suitable for formally assigning, it is to be forfeited.

There, the method of forfeiting is to be understood after the manner of c—“This robe of mine, venerable sirs, formally accepted from the hand of a bhikkhunī who is not related, unless [it is] in exchange, is to be forfeited”.^c

[This rule] was prescribed at Rājagaha (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Elder Udāyi (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter of formally accepting robes (= 3. *subject matter*).

This, [i.e.] “unless [it is] in exchange” (*aññatra pārivattakā*, Pāt 30.3; Kkh 109.5), is the supplementary prescription (*anupaññatti*) here (i.e. in Niss 5 M). [The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is [an offence of] wrong doing in the action of stretching forth a hand in order to take it. ⟨110⟩ “By [the very act of] receiving [it]”, it is to be forfeited; it is to be forfeited (alternative form).¹ There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.² And there is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking she was not a relative or for one who is in doubt in the case of a relative who is ordained in [the presence of] one Saṅgha (i.e. the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha) (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence in the case of taking on trust, in the case of a temporary thing, and in the case of a requisite not to be formally taken possession of such as a bag for the bowl, etc., in the case of taking from

^c—c Vin III 210,6ff.

¹ Kkh 110.1: *paṭilābhena nissaggiyam hoti. nissajjitabbam*. This is one of two instances in Kkh where the sentence *paṭilābhena nissaggiyam hoti* is followed by a form of the word *nissajjitabba*. For the other instance, see below, p. 255, n. 1. It is possible that *nissajjitabbam* here originally was a gloss that crept into the text. Alternatively, it could be influenced by the Vinaya text, where the sentence *paṭilābhena nissaggiyam hoti* is regularly followed by *nissajjitabbam samghassa vā gaṇassa vā puggalassa vā* (Vin III 210.5), “it is to be forfeited to the Saṅgha or a group or an individual”.

² For the explicit enumeration, see Kkh 108,21f.

⟨110⟩

Nissaggiyapācittiya 6 M

221

the hand of a trainee¹ or a female novice, and for one who is insane, etc.
 (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) the existence of a robe fit for assigning, (ii) the absence of exchange, (iii) taking from the hand of an unrelated [bhikkhunī] (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The [offence against this rule has the] origin of the [rule about] a go-between (Sgh 5 M) (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*),

[it originates in] activity and inactivity (= 11. *activity*).

The remainder² is exactly the same as for the fourth rule (Niss 4 M).

The commentary on the rule about formally accepting robes is finished.

[6. The commentary on the rule about asking a non-relative]

[6. Niss M: *If any bhikkhu should ask for robe material from a householder or householder's wife, not related [to him], unless [it is] on the [proper] occasion,³ there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture. There, this is the [proper] occasion: the bhikkhu has had a robe stolen or has lost a robe. This is the [proper] occasion there.*

(Pāt 30,6–9 = Vin III 212,28–31)]

In the sixth [rule] *householder* (*gahapatim*, Pāt 30,6) means: a man who has not gone forth among bhikkhus.

Householder's wife (*gahapatānim*, Pāt 30,6) means: a woman who has not gone forth among bhikkhunīs. This is the manner [in which they are to be understood] in all rules connected with householders.

Should ask (*viññāpeyya*, Pāt 30,7) means: should request or cause to request (alternative verb).

Unless [it is] on the [proper] occasion (*aññatra samayā*, Pāt 30,7) means: whoever has had his robe stolen or has lost his robe, for him, aside from that occasion, there is [an offence of] wrong doing in the action of asking on another [occasion].⁴ By [the very act of] receiving

¹ *sikkhamānā*; since the *sikkhamānā* status exists only for females, the trainee is female per se.

² This refers to the classification categories (12) to (17), see above, pp. 82ff.

³ *samayā*; in cases such as this, *samaya* should be translated as “convention” according to Mette 1991: 72f. But see the number of meanings discussed for *samaya* in Ud-a 18ff. (UC I 36ff.), As 57ff. (DB 128ff.).

⁴ Kkh-nt 305,20f.: *aññasmin ti* (Kkh 110,20) *aññasmin samaye*.

222 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture*⟨III⟩

[it], it is to be forfeited. There, the method of forfeiting is to be understood after the manner of “Venerable sirs, this robe, asked for from a householder [who is] not related [to me], unless [it is] on the [proper] occasion, is to be forfeited by me”.^d

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Upananda (= 2. *individual*), with respect to the subject matter of asking for a robe (= 3. *subject matter*).

This, [i.e.] “unless [it is] on the [proper] occasion” (*aññatrat samayā*, Pāt 30,7), is the supplementary prescription (*anupaññatti*) here (i.e. in Niss 6 M). [The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking it is not a relative when it is a relative, ⟨III⟩ or for one who is in doubt² (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one asking on the [proper] occasion or [asking] relatives and those who have given an invitation³ or for one asking the relatives of another one and those who have given an invitation to another one only on that one’s behalf [65] or for one acquiring it with his own resources, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

These are the four constituent factors here: (i) the existence of a robe fit to be formally assigned, (ii) the absence of the [proper] occasion, (iii) asking a non-relative, (iv) receiving by means of this [request]⁴ (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are exactly the same as for the fourth rule (Niss 4 M).

The commentary on the rule about asking a non-relative is finished.

^d–d Vin III 213,13f.

¹ Vin III 213,16–20 (BD II 48f.).

² Vin III 213,20f. (BD II 48f.).

³ *ñātaka-ppavārīte*; for a discussion of this compound, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 248] n. 16.

⁴ *tāya*, referring to a feminine word, obviously takes up *viññatti*, f.

[7. The commentary on the rule about more than that]

[7. Niss M: *If a householder or householder's wife not related [to the bhikkhu] should bring and invite him [to accept] many [pieces of] robe [material, then] at most [material for] a lower robe together with an upper robe is to be accepted therefrom as robe [material] by that bhikkhu. If he should accept more than that, there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture.*

(Pāt 30,11–14 = Vin III 214,19–22)]

In the seventh [rule], *If [...] him (tañ ce, Pāt 30,11)* means: [if ...] the one who has had his robe stolen or has lost his robe.

^e—In the word *abhihaṭṭhum*¹ (Pāt 30,12), *abhi* is a prefix; the meaning is “to bring” (*haritum*), that is to say, “to take” (*gaṇhitum*).

Should invite (*pavāreyya*, Pāt 30,12) means: should cause him to like, —^e should produce a liking, a preference. The meaning is “Should invite him thus: ‘As much as you wish, take that much.’” Alternatively, just as in the context of ^f—“having seen (*daṭṭhu*) renunciation [of the world] as firm security”, —^f the meaning [of *daṭṭhu*] is “having seen” (*disvā*); so here, too, the meaning [of the words] ^g—*abhihaṭṭhum pavāreyya*—^g is, having brought (*abhiharitvā*) [the robe material], should invite him (*nimanteryya*), either physically by putting [it] in front of [the bhikkhu] after having [it] brought (*upanetvā*), or verbally, saying, “As much as you wish from our cloths store, take that much.”

^h—*At most [material for] a lower robe together with an upper robe (santaruttaraparamam*, Pāt 30,12) means: of this robe [material]² at most [material for] an upper robe together with a lower robe (resolution of compound), that is “at most [material for] a lower robe together with an upper robe” (compound); that is to say, the maximum measure [to be accepted] from it (i.e. the offered robe material) is [material for] an outer garment (*pārupana*) together with an inner garment (*nivāsana*).³

^{e–e}Sp III 668,19–22 ^{f–f}Sn 424, 1098 ^{g–g}Sp III 668,33 ^{h–h}Sp III 668,33–69,4

¹ The texts offer two explanations, either understanding *abhihaṭṭhum* as an infinitive (Kkh 111,14f. = Sp III 668,19ff) or as the absolute of *abhiharati* (Kkh 111,17–21; Sp III 668,25–27; Ps II 264,6f; Mp V 96,4; Spk-pt II 341; Pāc-y 77,6f; etc.).

² *assa cīvarassa*; that is, the one offered to the bhikkhu.

³ *nivāsana* and *pārupana*, alternative terms for the *antara-vāsaka* and the *uttarā-saṅga*. *Nivāsana* also is the word used for a robe worn within the monastery.

224 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture* (112)

Is to be accepted therefrom as robe [material] (tato cīvaram sādi-tabbam, Pāt 30,13) means: from that robe [material that was] brought, so much robe [material] is to be taken, not more than that.^h

ⁱ—There, this is the regulation: Whoever had a [threefold] robe that had been formally taken possession of, [and] has lost [all] three [robes], he may accept two. Having put one on as the inner garment, having put one on as the outer garment, another is to be sought from the common store.¹ **(112)** Whoever has lost two, he may accept one. But if he normally wanders with an upper and a lower robe, he may accept two; thus he will be equal with a [bhikkhu] accepting only one.² [In the case] of one who has lost one of three, nothing is to be accepted. [In the case] of one who has lost one of two, one is to be accepted.³ [In the case] of one who had only one, and that [one] is lost, two are to be accepted.

But if five are lost by a bhikkhunī, two are to be accepted; if four are lost, one is to be accepted; if three are lost, none is to be accepted. There is no need to talk about two or one [being lost]. Because (*hi*) everyone must abide by the maximum of [one] upper robe and [one] lower robe,⁻ⁱ there is [an offence of] wrong doing in the action of asking ⁱ—for more than that.⁻ⁱ By [the very act of] receiving [it], it is to be forfeited. There, the method of forfeiting is to be understood after the manner of ^j—“Venerable sirs, this robe — asked for from a householder [who is] not related [to me], being more than the [allowed maximum] — is to be forfeited by me.”^{-j}

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter

ⁱ⁻ⁱSp III 669,8-19 ^{j-j}Vin III 214,36-15,1

¹ *sabhāga-īthānato*; literally “from a place for the same shares”; *sabhāga* refers to bhikkhus who have the same share, and thus form the same fraction. Obviously there is a place where this common share is deposited.

² The maximum number of robes a bhikkhu can accept is two. Normally the number of robes to be accepted is one lower than the number of robes taken away. Thus a bhikkhu with three robes who loses all, may take two; if he loses two, he may accept one. In a different case, a bhikkhu who only has two robes in total, and loses both, may take two. As the text states, in that case he is similar to the bhikkhu who lost two cloths and may accept one. What is meant is that in the end, both are clad in an upper and lower robe.

³ Kkh 112,4 starts a new paragraph after this sentence, though the text continues.

⟨II3⟩*Nissaggiyapācittiyā 8 M*

225

| of asking for many robes (= 3. *subject matter*).

| [The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and
bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

| It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

| There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ It is [an offence of]
| wrong doing for one thinking it is not a relative when it is a relative, or
| for one who is in doubt² (= 6. [sorts of] *offence*).

| There is no offence for one taking [it], saying “Having made two
| robes I will bring the rest back”; for one told, “Let the remainder be
| yours indeed”; for one taking what is not given due to [the fact that his
| robe] was stolen or lost; for one asking relatives and [those] who have
| given an invitation in the stated way; for one acquiring [it] with his own
| resources; and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

| These are the four constituent factors here: (i) it (i.e. the robe mater-
| ial) being more than that (i.e. than the allowed maximum), (ii) there
| being the cause [that one’s robe] has been stolen,³ etc., (i.e., or lost).
| [66] (iii) asking someone who is not a relative, (iv) and receiving by
| means of this [request]⁴ (= 9. *constituent factors*).

| The origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., are exactly the same as for
| the fourth rule (Niss 4 M).

| The commentary on the rule about more than that is finished.

| [8. The commentary on the first rule about laid by]

| [8. Niss M: *[It may be that] a robe fund has been laid by destined to a
bhikkhu by a householder or householder’s wife, not related [to that
bhikkhu, thinking], “With this robe fund, having purchased a robe, I
will dress the bhikkhu named so-and-so with a robe.”*] ⟨II3⟩ If that
bhikkhu should, having gone there without being previously invited,
suggest an alternative in respect of the robe, [saying], “[It would be]
truly good [if] you, sir, having purchased this or that kind of robe with
this robe fund, dressed me [with that]”, because of the desire for a fine
[robe], there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture.

| (Pāt 30,16–23 = Vin III 216,11–18)]

¹ Vin III 215,2ff. (BD II 56f.).

² Vin III 215,4 (BD II 56f.).

³ The rule Niss 7 M has been formulated for bhikkhus that have been robbed of
| their robes.

⁴ *tāya*; see above, p. 222, n. 4.

226 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture* (113)

In the eighth [rule] destined to a bhikkhu (*bhikkhum pan' eva uddissā*, Pāt 30,¹⁶) means: having indicated thus: “I will give to such-and-such a bhikkhu.”

^k—*A robe fund* (*cīvara-cetāpanam*, Pāt 30,¹⁷) means: the money for a robe, ^{—k} consisting of gold, etc.

^a—*Has been laid by* (*upakkhaṭam hoti*, Pāt 30,¹⁷) means: has been created, has been put down [by him] having accumulated it.—^a

Having purchased (*cetāpetvā*, Pāt 30,¹⁸) means: having bartered; the meaning is: having had made or having bought.

I will dress [*the bhikkhu*] *with a robe* (*cīvarena accchādēssāmi*, Pāt 30,¹⁹) means: this is a conventional phrase, but here the meaning is “I shall give to such-and-such a bhikkhu”.

^b—*If there that* [*bhikkhu*] (*tatra ce so*, Pāt 30,¹⁹) means: where that householder or householder's wife is, *if that bhikkhu should, having gone there,*¹ *without being previously invited, suggest an alternative in respect of the robe* (*tatra ce so bhikkhu pubbe appavārito upasaṅkamitvā cīvare vikappam āpajjeyya*, Pāt 30,^{19f}).² This is here the [syntactical] connection of the words.—^b

^c—*Should suggest an alternative* (*vikappam āpajjeyya*, Pāt 30,²⁰) means: should put forward a special practice, an additional arrangement.—^c But to show how [the bhikkhu] suggests it, [the text of the Pātimokkha] says, “[It would be] truly good” (*sādhū vata*, Pāt 30,²⁰), etc.

There, ^d—*good* (*sādhū*, Pāt 30,²⁰) is a particle [in the sense] of request.

Truly (*vata*, Pāt 30,²⁰) [is a particle in the sense] of consideration.

Me (*mam*, Pāt 30,²¹) indicates himself.

Sir (*āyasmā*, Pāt 30,²¹) addresses the other one.—^d

This or that kind (*evārūpam vā evārūpam vā*, Pāt 30,^{21f}) means: one or other among length, etc.

^e—*Because of desire for a fine [robe]* (*kalyāṇakamyatam upādāya*, Pāt 30,^{22f}) means: holding in [his] mind a desire for a beautiful [robe], a desire for an excellent [robe]. The [syntactical] connection of this (i.e. the phrase “because of desire for a fine [robe]”) is with this [word] “if he

^k—^kSp III 670,21

^a—^aSp III 670,23f.

^b—^bSp III 670,32—71,3

^c—^cSp III 671,7f.

^d—^dSp III 671,10f.

^e—^eSp III 671,13ff.

¹ Reading in Po; see Kkh 113, n. 5.

² Kkh 113,13 should read “*tatra ce so*”. At Kkh 113,15 “ce” should not be in italics.

⟨II4⟩*Nissaggiyapācittiya 8 M*

227

|*should suggest” (āpajjeyya, Pāt 30,2; ce, Pāt 30,19).^{1-e}*

| But if whoever, because of this [bhikkhu’s] words — suggesting [an
| alternative] of such a kind — purchases a more beautiful [robe],
| increasing the money [supply] above [the amount] intended at first,
| there is [an offence of] wrong doing for the bhikkhu in his (i.e. the
| donor’s) action. By [the very act of] receiving [it], it is to be forfeited.
| There, the method of forfeiting is to be understood after the manner of
| f—“Venerable sirs, this robe suggested as an alternative² [by me] —
| having approached that householder [who is] not related, who has not
| previously invited [me]³ ⟨II4⟩ — is to be forfeited by me.”—f

| [This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning
| Upananda (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter of suggest-
| ing an alternative in respect of a robe (= 3. *subject matter*).
|

| [The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and
| bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).
|

| It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).
|

| There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.⁴ It is [an offence of]
| wrong doing for one thinking it is not a relative when it is a relative or
| for one who is in doubt⁵ (= 6. [sorts of] *offence*).
|

f-f Vin III 217,9ff.

¹ Kkh 113,24 “āpajjeyya ce” should be in italics.

² *vikappam āpannañ* (Kkh 114,1); these words must refer to *cīvarañ* qualifying
the robe the bhikkhu now has to forfeit as one that had been purchased, etc.,
because he had suggested an alternative to the originally intended robe.

³ *pubbe appavāritam*, Kkh 113,28 without v.l. in Kkh, and no comments in the
commentaries. The parallel in Vin III 217,9ff. reads *appavārito* which describes
the subject of the sentence. A similar sentence in Kkh 114,26–15,1 (Niss 9 M),
however, reads ... *cīvarañ pubbe appavārite aññātakā gahapatikē upa-*
sañkamitvā, clearly showing that *appavārite* is understood as an adjective
relating to *gahapatikē*. Likewise, the *appavāritam* in our present passage
obviously is understood as an adjective relating to *gahapatikāñ*. Thus we
have to understand it in an active sense, “having invited, having given an
invitation”; see also below in the compound *ñātakappavārita* (Kkh 114,7).
Regarding the problem connected with the terms *ñātaka* and *pavārita* in a
wider sense, see Kieffer-Püls 2013: III [Z 248] n. 16.

⁴ Vin III 217,14–20 (BD II 56f.).

⁵ Vin III 217,20f. (BD II 57).

228 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture*(**II4**)

There is no offence for one saying to the person desirous of purchasing an expensive [robe], “Give me a cheaper one, or give me another one of such a kind for exactly the same [amount of] money”, for one asking relatives and those who have given an invitation in the stated way, for one acquiring [it] with his own resources, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) the fact of desiring more in respect of a robe, (ii) asking a non-relative, (iii) and the receiving by means of this [request]¹ (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are exactly the same as for the fourth rule (Niss 4 M).

The commentary on the first rule about laid by is finished.

[9. The commentary on the second rule about laid by]

[9. Niss M: *[It may be that] individual robe funds have been laid by destined to a bhikkhu by a householder or householder's wife, not related [to the bhikkhu, thinking], “With these individual robe funds, having purchased individual robes, we will dress the bhikkhu named so-and-so with robes”. If that bhikkhu should, having gone there without being previously invited, suggest an alternative in respect of the robe, [saying, “It would be] truly good [if] you, sirs, having purchased this or that kind of robe with these individual robe funds, dressed me, [the] two [of you] being [together], with one [robe]”, because of the desire for a fine [robe], there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture.*

(Pāt 32,2-11 = Vin III 218,30-38)]

In the ninth [rule] ^g—the meaning is to be understood in exactly the same way.^g For this is like a ^h—supplementary prescription^h of the previous one. ^h—Only there, the trouble was caused for one [person], here for two. This is the difference here. All the remainder is exactly the same as the previous. And the offence is to be understood as for one taking [a robe having caused trouble] for two [people], so also for one taking [a robe] having caused trouble for many.^h

And in the method of forfeiting, the difference of the words is to be

^g—^gSp III 672,1 ^h—^h≠ Sp III 672,2-5

¹ *tāya*; see above, p. 222, n. 4.

Page 277 job: 1272818

⟨II5⟩ *Nissaggiyapācittiya 10 M* 229

|made known after the manner of i—“Venerable sirs, this robe [67] sug-
|gested as an alternative¹ [by me], having approached householders not
|related who have not previously invited [me], ⟨II5⟩ is to be forfeited by
|me.”¹

|The commentary on the second rule about laid by is finished.

[10. The commentary on the rule about kings]

|[10. Niss M: *Should a king or a king’s officer or a brahman or a*
householder send a robe fund destined to a bhikkhu by a messenger
[saying], “Having purchased a robe with this robe fund, dress the
bhikkhu named so-and-so with a robe.” If that messenger having
approached that bhikkhu should speak thus, “Sir, this robe fund has
been brought destined to the venerable one; let the venerable one
formally accept the robe fund”, then that messenger is to be spoken to
thus by that bhikkhu, “Friend, we do not formally accept the robe fund,
but we formally accept a robe at the [proper] time, [if it is] lawful.” If
that messenger should say to that bhikkhu thus, “Does the venerable
one have a steward?”, bhikkhus, a monastery attendant or a lay
follower is to be indicated as a steward by the bhikkhu if he needs a
robe [saying], “Friend, this one is the bhikkhus’ steward.” If that
messenger, having instructed the steward, having approached that
bhikkhu should say thus, “Sir, the steward whom the venerable one
indicated has been instructed by me; let the venerable one approach
him at the right time; he will dress you with a robe”; then, bhikkhus,²
the steward may be prompted and reminded two or three times by the
bhikkhu, having approached him, if he needs a robe, [saying], “Friend,
I have need of a robe.” If prompting and reminding two or three times
he should succeed in obtaining that robe, that is good. If he should not
succeed in obtaining it, he is to stand in silence for that purpose four
times, five times, or six times at most. If on standing for that purpose
four times, five times, or six times at most he should succeed in

i-iVin B^e I 322 (elided at Vin E^e III 219,20)

¹ *vikappam āpannam* (Kkh 114,27); see above, p. 227, n. 2.
² Concerning the unusual occurrence of this direct address in the Pātimokkha which otherwise is used in the Khandhakas, see von Hinüber 1999: 70.

230 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture*⟨116⟩

obtaining that robe, that is good. [If he should not succeed in obtaining it in that way, but] if striving more than this, he should succeed in obtaining that robe, then there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture. If he should not succeed in obtaining it, he is to go himself or send a messenger to the place from which the robe fund was brought to him [to say], “That robe fund that you, venerable sirs, sent destined to a bhikkhu has provided no benefit at all for that bhikkhu. Let the venerable ones obtain what is theirs. May what is yours not be lost.” This is the proper course here.

(Pāt 32,13–34,21 = Vin III 221,15–22,8)]

⟨116⟩ In the tenth [rule] ^j-*a king's officer* (*rājabhogga*, Pāt 32,13) means: he has something to be enjoyed (*bhogga*), [that is] something to be used (*bhuñjitabbam*) (alternative form) from the king, [that is] a king's officer (*rāja-bhoggo*). There is also the variant reading *rāja-bhogo*. The meaning is: he has wealth (*bhogo*) from the king.^j

A robe fund (*cīvaracetāpanam*, Pāt 32,14) means: [something] unlawful such as gold.

^k-*Should send* means: should despatch^{-k} (alternative verb).

With this (*imina*, Pāt 32,15), etc., is said to show the purity of [his] coming. For if he should send [saying], “Give this to the bhikkhu so-and-so”, because of the impurity of his coming with reference to an unlawful object, even a legalizer could not be pointed out by the bhikkhu.

^a-*Brought* (*ābhataṁ*, Pāt 32,18) means: conveyed^{-a} (alternative verb).

We do not (*na kho mayam*, Pāt 32,20), etc.: this is said to show that this [amount of] money for a robe, although brought in a lawful manner, becomes unlawful because of the messenger's utterance of such a kind; therefore, it must be rejected. Gold, silver, *kahāpaṇa*,¹ [and] *māsaka*² are the four objects to be forfeited. Pearls, jewels, lapis lazuli, mother-of-pearl, stone, coral, red-eye, and cats-eye³ stones, the seven types of

^j-^jSp III 672,14ff.

^k-^kSp III 672,16

^a-^aSp III 672,20

¹ *kahāpaṇa*; “a certain coin (made of various metals); money.” (DOP s.v.). See also BD I 71, n. 2.

² *māsaka m.n.*; a small coin that may consist of copper, lac, or wood BD I 71, n. 2; 72, n. 1.

³ *masāragalla, m.n.*; “a precious stone, cat's eye” (PED s.v.).

⟨II7⟩*Nissaggiyapācittiya 10 M*

231

grain, male and female slaves, fields and building grounds, flower gardens, fruit gardens, etc., these are objects of [offences of] wrong doing, and it is not suitable to accept them either for oneself or for the *cetiya*, the Saṅgha, a group, or an individual. Therefore, to show that it is not suitable to accept them, it is said “we do not”, etc. (*na kho mayam*).

But we formally accept a robe (cīvarañ ca kho mayam paṭiggañhāma, Pāt 32,21f.): but because this was brought destined to himself, it is suitable to say this [sentence]; therefore, it is said [in the Pātimokha].

b—At the [proper] time (kālena, Pāt 32,22) means: when the right time has arrived; the meaning is: when we have a need, then we formally accept a lawful robe.^{-b}

c—A steward (veyyāvaccakaro, Pāt 32,23) means: a legalizer.^{-c}

Is to be indicated (niddisitabbo, Pāt 34,1): this is permitted, because it was said with the lawful utterance, “Does the venerable one have a steward?” But if the messenger says, “Who will take this?” or “To whom shall I give it?”, [then a steward] is not to be indicated.

A monastery attendant or a lay follower (ārāmiko vā upāsako vā, Pāt 34,1): this is said because of [their] suitability, but excepting the five co-religionists, anyone is suitable as a legalizer.

Friend, this one (eso kho, āvuso, Pāt 34,1): this is said to show the lawful utterance of the bhikkhu. ⟨II7⟩ For just so is it to be said. “Give to him”, etc., is not to be said.

d—[The steward has been] instructed by me (saññatto so mayā, Pāt 34,5) means: [he] has been ordered by me. The meaning is: [the bhikkhu]¹ has been spoken to thus [by the messenger], “He (i.e. the steward) will give a robe to you when there is need of a robe.”^{-d} For only if [the bhikkhu] has been informed thus by the messenger is it suitable [for him] to prompt the [steward, but] definitely not because [the messenger] merely has gone, giving [it] into the [steward’s] hand. But if [the steward] has been indicated [to the messenger] face-to-face [with the words], “This is my steward”, and actually face-to-face, the messenger gives the fund into the [steward’s] hand, going away [with

^b—^bSp III 672,20ff. ^c—^cSp III 672,22f. ^d—^dSp III 672,23ff.

¹ The subject of this sentence is clearly indicated by the context from which the *pratika* is quoted (Pāt 32,16ff.).

232 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture* (117)

the words], “Having bought a robe give it to the elder”, in this way it is suitable [for the bhikkhu] to prompt [the steward], even if [the words], “He has been instructed by me” (*saññatto so mayā*, Pāt 34.5), are not said [by the messenger to the bhikkhu]. But if just as he is going away the messenger goes away, either saying to the bhikkhu “I will give [it] into his hand, you may receive a robe”, or sending another, causing him to announce [it to the bhikkhu], this being so, it is suitable [for the bhikkhu] to prompt even that other one. [68]

And [the word] *by a messenger* (Pāt 32.14) is merely a brief indication.¹ The characteristic is exactly the same also for one who, having brought it himself, acts thus (i.e. as a messenger).

^e—*Friend, I have need of a robe (attho me, āvuso, cīvaraṇa, Pāt 34.8):* this is an example of the characteristic of prompting.^e For if he prompts him verbally, either this phrase should be said or [words with the same] meaning as it in any language. But it is not suitable to say anything in the manner of “Give me, bring me”.

Should succeed in obtaining (abhinippahādeyya, Pāt 34.9) means: thus having made a speech, prompting three times, he should succeed by virtue of receiving [it].

That is good (icc etam kusalam, Pāt 34.9f.) means: that is fine.

^f—*Six times at most (chakkhattuparamam, Pāt 34.11):* this is an adverb (lit. a neuter word denoting action).² For six times at most he may stand in silence for a robe.^f He must not sit down. He must not formally accept food. The Doctrine must not be preached. But being asked, “Why have you come?”, he may say only this much, “You should know, friend.” If he does such things as sitting, etc., he breaks the standing [in silence],³ he destroys the reason for coming. This is said in order to show the characteristics of prompting physically.

^{e–e}Sp III 672,25f. ^{f–f}Sp III 673,15ff.

¹ *desanā-mattam*; see above, p. 96, n. 7.

² *bhāva-napumsaka-vacanam*; Pind 1989: 34 renders it as “a term in the neuter that qualifies a verbal action” and states that this term has no parallel in Sanskrit. He furthermore refers to Aggavāmsa’s Saddanīti where it is stated that this term is used in the scriptures in contrast to *kiriyāvisesana*, which is used in grammar. See also Deokar 2008: 249f.

³ This means that his presence does not count as prompting.

And here, because of permitting three promptings at most and six standings, a double standing is allowed for one prompting. Therefore, if he only prompts, [but] does not stand, six promptings are obtained. If he only stands, [but] does not prompt, twelve standings are obtained. If he does both, for one ⟨118⟩ prompting, two standings are to be given up.

There, whoever on a single day, having gone again and again, prompts six times, or having gone only once, says six times, “I need a robe, friend”, similarly [whoever] on a single day, having gone again and again, stands twelve times, or having gone only once, stands here and there, he breaks all the promptings and all the standings. What need is there of talking about one acting thus on different days?¹

The [following] is the [detailed] regulation in that connection: Whoever the donor goes to just by himself and points out as legalizers, however, it is suitable to prompt them even one hundred times.² But whoever is not indicated even by the two [of them]³ (i.e. bhikkhus and messengers), [namely] a legalizer with his face turned towards [them] (i.e. in their presence) (*mukhavevaṭika-kappiyakāraka*)⁴ and a legalizer with his face

¹ For the methods of prompting and standing in silence, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 156].

² This is the second subgroup of the first group of legalizers (see below, p. 233, n. 3), namely those indicated by the messenger or the donor (but not by a bhikkhu). One may prompt them as often as one wants because the rules laid down in Niss 10 M do not apply to them. See Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 157].

³ According to Sp III 675,^{2ff} two types of *kappiya-kāraka* are to be distinguished, (1) those indicated (*riddittha*) and (2) those not indicated (*aniddittha*). The indicated legalizers are further divided into (1.1) indicated by a bhikkhu, and (1.2) indicated by a messenger. Both groups have four subsections depending on the way in which the *kappiya-kāraka* is indicated. The methods described in Niss 10 M are to be applied to group (1.1). The group of not indicated *kappiya-kārakas* consists of (2.1) the *mukha-vevaṭika-kappiya-kāraka*, “a legalizer with his face turned towards [them]” (see below, pp. 233f., n. 4), (2.2) and the *parammukha-kappiya-kāraka*, “a legalizer with his face turned away” (see below, p. 234, n. 1).

⁴ Sp III 676,²⁷⁻³²: *aparo bhikkhu purimanayen’ eva dūtena pucchito “nath’ amhākamp kappiyakārako” ti vadati. tad añño samīpe thito sutvā “āhara bho aham ayyassa cīvaraṁ cetāpetvā dassāmī” ti vadati. dūto “handā bho dadeyyasī” ti tassa hatthe datvā bhikkhusa anārocetvā va gacchati, ayam mukhavevaṭikakappiyakārako.* “Asked by a messenger in exactly the previous manner, another bhikkhu says, ‘I don’t have a legalizer.’ Having heard this,

234 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture*(**118**)

turned away (i.e. in absentia) (*parammukha-kappiyakāraka*),¹ he is not to be spoken to at all.² Thus, here, all ten legalizers are shown.

If more than this (*tato ce uttari*, Pāt 34,¹⁴) means: more than the stated measure of promptings and standings.

Forfeiture (*nissaggiyam*, Pāt 34,¹⁵) means: for one making more efforts, there is [an offence of] wrong doing for all actions. By [the very act of] receiving [it], it is to be forfeited. And here the method of forfeiting is to be understood after the manner of g—“Venerable sirs, this robe obtained by prompting more than three times [and] by standing more than six times is to be forfeited by me.”^g

^h—*From which the robe fund was brought to him* (*yat' assa cīvara-cetāpanam ābhataṁ*, Pāt 34,¹⁶) means: from whichever (*yato*) king or king's officer the robe fund was brought to that bhikkhu. There is also a variant reading *yatvassa*. The meaning is the same.^h

ⁱ—*There* (*tattha*, Pāt 34,¹⁶) means: [in] the presence of that king or king's officer. For this is a locative case in the sense of vicinity.

That [robe fund] has provided no benefit at all for that bhikkhu (*na tam tassa bhikkhuno kiñci attaṁ anubhoti*, Pāt 34,¹⁹) means: that fund has not produced any result for that bhikkhu, not even a trifling one.

Let the venerable ones obtain what is theirs (*yuñjant' āyasmanto sakam*, Pāt 34,^{19f.}) means: let the venerable ones obtain the fund that is

^g—^gVin III 223,9ff. ^h—^hSp III 674,20ff. ⁱ—ⁱSp III 674,24–30

another one staying close by says, ‘Bring [it], sir; having acquired a robe, I will give it to the worthy one.’ The messenger [saying,] ‘Well then, sir, you shall give [it],’ putting [it] in his hand, without informing the bhikkhu, goes away. This is a legalizer with his face turned towards [them] (that is, in the presence of the bhikkhu).”

¹ Sp III 676,32–77,2: *aparo bhikkhuno upaṭṭhākassa vā aññassa vā hatthe akappiyavatthūṇ datvā therassa cīvaraṁ dadeyyasī ti etto va pakkamatī, ayam parammukhākappiyakārako ti ...* “Having put an unlawful object in the hand of a bhikkhu's steward or someone else's hand, he goes away with only so much, ‘You shall give a robe to the elder’, this is a legalizer with his face turned away (that is, in absentia).”

² Sp III 677,2f. specifies that one shall behave vis-à-vis them as in the case of persons not related and those who have not given an invitation. Contrary to that, for the *kappiya-kārakas* indicated by a messenger, the rules given in the Menḍaka section (Mahāvagga VI 34 = Vin I 240,5–45,7) are valid. See Kieffer-Püllz 2013: II [Z 157].

⟨119⟩*Nissaggiyapācittiya 10 M*

235

their own property.

May what is yours [69] not be lost (mā vo sakam vinassa, Pāt 34.²⁰)
means: may your property not be lost.⁻ⁱ

This is the proper course here (ayam tattha sāmīcī, Pāt 34.^{20f}) means:
this is the right method here, following the supermundane law. ⟨119⟩
The meaning is: natural conformity to the rules of conduct. Therefore,
one not doing thus, in violating the custom, commits [an offence of]
wrong doing.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning
 Upananda (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter [that
 Upananda], being spoken to [with the words], j—“Wait this day, sir”, —j
 did not wait (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and
 bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ It is [an offence of]
 wrong doing for one thinking he had exceeded the number when the
 promptings and standings had not been exceeded or for one who is in
 doubt² (= 6. [sorts of] *offence*).

There is no offence if it has been received without prompting, or
 given by the owners having prompted, and for one who is insane, etc. (=
 7. *non-offence*).

These are the four constituent factors here: (i) the designation of a
 legalizer by the bhikkhu,³ (ii) being handed over by a messenger, (iii) the
 effort beyond this,⁴ (iv) obtaining [a robe] by means of that effort (=
 9. *constituent factors*).

j—j Vin III 220,²⁹

¹ Vin III 223,^{19–24} (BD II 69).

² Vin III 223,^{24–27} (BD II 69).

³ This translation follows the explanation in Sp-t (II 412,^{18f}), where Sāriputta
 reads *bhikkhunā nidditṭha-bhāvo* for Kkh (119,8) *bhikkhuno nidditṭha-bhāvo*.
 Sāriputta's reading certainly is the right interpretation since the rules for how
 to prompt, etc., a *kappiya-kāraka* — dealt with in the commentary on Niss 10
 M — only apply to *kappiya-kārakas* indicated by bhikkhus, not to those indicated
 by donors; see above, p. 233, n. 3.

⁴ That is, the effort beyond the allowed number of times for prompting or stand-
 ing still.

236 Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture<120>

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are exactly the same as for the fourth rule (Niss 4 M).

The commentary on the rule about kings is finished.

The section about robes, the first.

[II. The section about sheep's wool]

[I. The commentary on the rule about silk]

[11. Niss M: *If any bhikkhu should get a rug made mixed with silk, there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture.*

(Pāt 36,3f. = Vin III 224,24f.)]

In the first [rule] of the section about sheep's wool, *mixed with silk* (*kosiyamissakam*, Pāt 36,3) means: mixed with even one thread of silk, even one which has dropped by the force of the wind in the place where it was being made.

Rug (*santhatam*, Pāt 36,3) means: having the characteristic of requiring to be made k- by having spread out silk threads right above a level piece of ground, [and] having sprinkled [them] with gruel, etc.-k

Should have [a rug] made, [there is an offence entailing ...] forfeiture (*kārāpeyya nissaggiyam*, Pāt 36,3f.) means: there is [an offence of] wrong doing in actions of making and causing to be made. By [the very act of] receiving [it], it is to be forfeited. And here the method of forfeiting is to be understood after the manner of a—"Venerable sirs, this rug of mine, caused to be made mixed with silk, is to be forfeited [by me]".—a In conformity to this very statement, from here on out every rug is to be understood. Because it is possible to know it by this much, we will not show it from now on.¹ <120>

[This rule] was prescribed at Ālavī (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter of causing a rug to be made mixed with silk (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is connected with commanding [someone else] by virtue of having caused it to be made for oneself (= 5. *command*).

k-kSp III 684,5f. a-aVin III 224,32ff.

¹ Author's guideline for future rules.

⟨120⟩

Nissaggiyapācittiya 12 M

237

There is a set of four offences of expiation because of the manner of himself causing to finish what has been left unfinished.¹ It is [an offence of] wrong doing in making [it] or causing [it] to be made for the sake of another and in using [it] after receiving one made by another² (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence in the making of a canopy, etc., and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) the state of being mixed with silk, (ii) making or causing to be made a rug for oneself, (iii) and receiving [it] (= 9. constituent factors).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are exactly in the manner stated in the rule about causing to be washed³ (Niss 4 M).

The commentary on the rule about silk is finished.

[2. The commentary on the rule about pure black sheep's wool]

[12. Niss M: *If any bhikkhu should have a rug made of pure black sheep's wool, there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture.*

(Pāt 36,6f. = Vin III 225,29f.)]

In the second [rule], ^b-of pure black (*suddhakālakānam*, Pāt 36,6) means: of pure black (resolution of compound), [the meaning is:]⁴ not mixed with others.^{-b}

^b-bSp III 684,13ff.

¹ The Vinaya describes the following four cases: (1) finishing himself what was incompletely executed by himself, (2) making others finish what was incompletely executed by himself, (3) finishing himself what was incompletely executed by others, (4) making others finish what was incompletely executed by others (Vin III 225,1-5).

² See Vin III 225,5ff. (BD II 72f.).

³ This reference must be to Niss 4 M since the only other rule dealing with *dhvāpana* is Niss 17 M, which only follows, and, furthermore, refers back to the present rule for its classification. Thus, this indicates that an older name of Niss 4 M (now called *purāṇa-cīvara-sikkhāpada* in Kkh and Sp) might have been *dhvāpana-sikkhāpada*.

⁴ Sp adds *ti attho* after *aññehi amissitakālakānam*, clearly indicating that the second part is an explanation as to content.

238 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture*⟨121⟩

[This rule] was prescribed at Vesāli (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six (= 2. *individuals*), with respect to the subject matter of making such a rug (= 3. *subject matter*).

The remainder is exactly the same as for the first rule (Niss 11 M).

The commentary on the rule about pure black [sheep's wool] is finished.

[3. The commentary on the rule about two portions]

[13. Niss M: *When a bhikkhu is having a new rug made, two parts of pure black sheep's wool are to be taken, the third of white, the fourth of ruddy brown. If a bhikkhu should have a new rug made without taking two parts of pure black sheep's wool, the third of white, the fourth of ruddy brown, there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture.*

(Pāt 36,9–14 = Vin III 226,23–28)]

[70] In the third [rule] ^ctwo parts (*dve bhāgā*, Pāt 36,9f.) means: two portions.

Are to be taken (*ādātabbā*, Pāt 36,10) means: are to be taken (alternative word).

Of ruddy brown (*gocariyānam*, Pāt 36,11) means: of reddish colour.^c

But this is the regulation here: ⟨121⟩^d—from however many [threads (?)] one is desirous of making [it], among those, having weighed out, two portions are to be taken of black, one of white, one of ruddy brown.^d In the event of exceeding by even one black hair, it is to be forfeited. Less is suitable.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter of making such a rug (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The offence originates in] activity and inactivity (= 11. *activity*).

The remainder is exactly the same as for the first rule (Niss 11 M).

^{c–c}Sp III 684,20f. ^{d–d}≠ Sp III 684,23f.

⟨121⟩

Nissaggiyapācittiya 14 M

239

| It is not suitable to use these three [rugs] even if they are received back
| after having been forfeited.¹

| The commentary on the rule about two portions is finished.

| [4. The commentary on the rule about six years]

| [14. Niss M: *When a bhikkhu has had a new rug made, it is to be used*
| *for six years. If the bhikkhu should get another new rug made within six*
| *years, whether having got rid of the [first] rug or not, unless [it is] with*
| *the permission of the bhikkhus, there is an offence entailing expiation*
| *with forfeiture.*

| (Pāt 36,16–20 = Vin III 229,7–12)]

| In the fourth [rule] e—if within six years (*orena ce channam vassānam*,
| Pāt 36,17) means: in less than six years, the meaning is “within [six
| years]”.^e

| Unless [it is] with the permission of the bhikkhus (*aññatra bhikkhu-*
| *sammutiyā*, Pāt 36,19) means: whatever permission for a rug the Saṅgha
| gives to a bhikkhu who is ill, except for that. For one making another
| rug within six years, not having received permission, there is forfeiture.

| [This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning
| many bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*), with respect to the subject matter of
| causing a rug to be made every year (= 3. *subject matter*).

| This “unless [it is] with the permission of the bhikkhus” (*aññatra*
| *bhikkhu-sammutiyā*, Pāt 36,19) is the supplementary prescription
| (*anupaññatti*) here (i.e. in Niss 14 M) (= 4. *prescription*).

| By whom it is received, f—as long as his illness does not cease,^f or
| [if] ceasing it arises again, for so long it is suitable to make one even
| every year in the various places he goes to. It is suitable to have one

e—eSp III 685,11f. f—fSp III 685,5

¹ This sentence, coming after the end of the commentary on Niss 13 M and referring to the rules Niss 11 to 13 M, being outside the general arrangement of the commentary on the rules, looks as if it was added later. It is not commented upon in Kkh-pt, but in Kkh-nt 318,4ff.: *imāni tūṇi na kevalam anissa-*
tthān’ eva paribhuñjituṇ na vaṭṭantī ti āha imāni panā ti ādi. paribhuñjituṇ
na vaṭṭantī ti iminā yadi paribhuñjati, dukkaṭan ti dasseti. “[Insofar as] these three are not suitable to be used, not only when they have not been forfeited, [the author of Kkh] says **But these**, etc. With the [phrase] **They are not suitable to be used**, he shows that [there is an offence of] wrong doing when

240 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture* (122)

made for another and having received one made [by someone else]¹
even to use it (= 7. *non-offence*).

The remainder is exactly the same as for the first rule (Niss 11 M).

The commentary on the rule about six years is finished. (122)

[5. The commentary on the rule about a sitting rug]

[15. Niss M: *When a bhikkhu is having a sitting rug made, [a piece] of an old rug a current span all round is to be taken in order to make it unsightly. If a bhikkhu should have a new sitting rug made without taking a [piece] of an old rug a current span all round, there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture.*

(Pāt 36,22–38,2 = Vin III 232,12–16)]

In the fifth [rule] *an old rug* (*purāṇa-santhataṃ* ≠ Pāt 36,23)² means:
one on which someone has sat down or lain down even once.

^g—*All around* (*sāmantā*, Pāt 36,23) means: having cut a circle or a rectangle from one side, it is to be held so that the part held measures a span (*vidatthi**). But by the one spreading it out, it is either to be spread out in one part, or it is to be spread out having frayed it and having mixed it. Thus it becomes stronger.—^g

^g—^gSp III 687,9–14

one uses [them].” In Sp a similar additional paragraph is added after the fifteenth Nissaggiya rule, Sp III 687,17ff.: *imesu pana pañcasu santhatesu purimāni tīni vinayakammāni katvā paṭilabhitvā paribhūñjituṃ na vaṭṭanti, pacchimāni dve vaṭṭantī ti veditabbāni* (v.l. °bbānī ti). “But among these five [types] of rugs, the earlier three are to be understood as [ones that are] not suitable to be used [even] after having carried out the procedure [of forfeiture, and] having received [them] back. The latter two are to be understood as suitable.”

This sentence of Sp is to be traced also in Kkh-pṭ 82,22ff. at the end of Niss 15 M. Cf. Kieffer-Pülz 2013: III Anhang B [Z 467].

¹ Supplemented following Vin III 229,31f. *aññena kalam paṭilabhitvā pari-bhūñjati* in the *anāpatti* formula.

² *purāṇa-santhata*; the old rug appears several times in this rule, but never in the nominative. It is conspicuous that the word *nisidana-santhata* is not commented upon (neither in Kkh nor in Sp III 685,20–87,16), despite its central role for this rule.

⟨123⟩*Nissaggiyapācittiya 16 M*

241

If without taking (*anādā ce*, Pāt 36,24) means: not having taken it if there is an old rug. But if there is no [old rug], even not having taken [it], is suitable. It is suitable to have one made for another, and having received one made [by someone else], even to use it.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning many bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter of getting rid of [former] rugs (= 3. *subject matter*).

The remainder is exactly the same as for the third rule (Niss 13 M).

The commentary on the rule about a sitting [rug]¹ is finished.

[6. The commentary on the rule about sheep's wool]

[16. Niss M: *Should sheep's wool accrue to a bhikkhu when he has set out on a road for travelling, it may be formally accepted by the bhikkhu if he wishes. Having formally accepted it, it is to be carried [by him] with his own hand for three leagues (yojana*) at most, there being no one to carry [it]. If he should carry it further than that, even though there is no one to carry [it], there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture.*

(Pāt 38,4-8 = Vin III 233,30-34)]

In the sixth [rule] to [him] when he has set out on a road for travelling (*addhāna-magga-ppatipannassa*, Pāt 38,4) means: to [him] when he has set out on a long road which is called [a road] for travelling (or: a high road). All of this, however (*ca*), is only to show the mere subject matter. But there is no fault for one taking it, having obtained it lawfully somewhere or other.

Three leagues at most (tiyojanaparamam, Pāt 38,6) means: a region three leagues in distance from the place it was taken.

^h-With his own hand (*sahatthā*, Pāt 38,6) means: with his own hand (alternative form);^h the meaning is: ^h-the [sheep's wool threads] must be carried by him [himself].^h

⟨123⟩ Even though there is no [71] one to carry [it] (*asante pi hārake*, Pāt 38,7) means: even though there is indeed no one else to

^{h-h}Sp III 687,24f

¹ *nisidana-sikkhāpada* in Kkh 122,18; *nisidana-santhata-sikkhāpada* in Sp III 687,16. See also Pāc 89 M called *nisidana-sikkhāpada* in Pāt 80,9; Kkh 245,8,24.

242 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture* (123)

carry it [as a carrier]. But if there is [a carrier], it is suitable to have [him] take it.

There is [an offence of] wrong doing for one going even a single step beyond three leagues (*yojana**), having taken it, even having put [it] inside his ear himself, without having tied it with a thread, as a precaution against the wind disease. There is [an offence entailing] expiation with forfeiture in the event of going a second step beyond.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning a certain bhikkhu (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter of going beyond three leagues (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking it was more in the event of it being less than three leagues, or for one who is in doubt² (= 6. [sorts of] *offence*).

There is no offence in carrying it three leagues (*yojana**) and bringing it back, having gone with the intention of dwelling, in carrying it from there to another place, or in carrying it having received it back when it had been stolen or lost, in causing another to carry [it],³ in carrying bundled goods (*kata-bhanda*) at least tied with a thread,⁴ and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the five constituent factors here: (i) the fact that it is goods of sheep's wool that are not bundled, (ii) receiving [it] first,⁵ (iii) going

¹ Vin III 234,21–24 (BD II 92).

² Vin III 234,24f. (BD II 92f.).

³ In Vin III 30 we have *aññam harāpeti katabhandam*, translated by IBH as “if he makes another convey goods tied up in a bundle” (BD II 93). This is a single non-offence factor. Thus this sentence of Kkh (*aññam harāpane*) judged from the Vinaya should be connected with the next (*antamaso sutta-kena pi baddhakatabhāṇḍaharāṇe*). But no commentary discusses this passage. Kkh-nṭ 320,26ff. simply takes over the commentary on *katabhandam* from Sp III 689,1ff.

⁴ To have someone carry bundled goods is allowed (Vin III 234,30). For a discussion of the question of who is allowed to carry bundled goods, see Kieffer-Püllz 2013: II [Z 160]. Goods are considered bundled if they are at least tied with a thread, see Kieffer-Püllz 2013: II [Z 160], especially n. 57.

⁵ For the controversial discussion of this factor in the commentaries, see Appendix 25.

⟨124⟩*Nissaggiyapācittiya 18 M*

243

beyond three leagues, either taking it oneself or putting it into another's vehicle when he did not know, (iv) carrying and bringing it back, (v) the intention of dwelling (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The [offence against this rule has the] origin of [the rule about] sheep's wool (Niss 16 M) (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*),
 [it originates in] activity (= 11. *activity*),
 [has] no acquittal due to [lacking] awareness (= 12. *awareness*),
 [is] not [dependent on] intention (= 13. *intention*),
 [is] a fault according to a precept [laid down by the Buddha] (= 14. *fault*),
 [is] a physical deed (= 15. *deed*),
 [is done with] three [types of] thought (= 16. *thoughts*),
 [with] three [types of] feeling (= 17. *feelings*).

The commentary on the rule about sheep's wool is finished.

[7. The commentary on the rule about having sheep's wool washed]

[17. Niss M: *If any bhikkhu should have sheep's wool washed or dyed or carded by a bhikkhunī not related [to him], there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture.*

(Pāt 38,10ff. = Vin III 235,27ff.)]

In the seventh [rule, the rule] was prescribed in the Sakka [country] (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter of having sheep's wool washed (= 3. *subject matter*).

There, the whole regulation is to be understood exactly in the manner stated in the [rule of] having an old robe washed¹ (Niss 4 M).

The commentary on the rule about having sheep's wool washed is finished. ⟨124⟩

[8. The commentary on the rule about gold]

[18. Niss M: *If any bhikkhu should either take up gold or silver or have it taken up, or should accept it when deposited [for him], there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture.*

(Pāt 38,14ff. = Vin III 237,36ff.)]

¹ The name used for Niss 4 M here is *purāna-cīvara-dhovāpana* in contrast to the title *purāna-cīvara-sikkhāpada* used in Kkh in connection with Niss 4 M itself.

244 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture* (124)

In the eighth [rule], *gold and silver* (*jātarūparajatam*, Pāt 38,14ff.) means: gold and silver (alternative words), and moreover a *kahāpana*, also a *māsaka* of copper, a *māsaka* of wood, a *māsaka* of lac, etc., which are used in business — all of these here are said to be silver (*rajatam*).¹

*Should either take up*² (*ugganheyya vā*, Pāt 38,14) means: having seen [something] given for his own use, or [something] being somewhere or other not having been taken possession of [by anyone else] should either take it himself.

Or should have [it] taken up (*ugganhāpeyya vā*, Pāt 38,14f.) means: or should have just that one taken by another.

Or should accept it when deposited (*upanikkhittam vā sādiyeyya*, Pāt 38,15) means: something abandoned [by someone else] in having stated verbally or by bodily gestures, “[This is] for you”, either [saying with respect to goods that are] in [his] presence thus, “Let this be for the honourable one”, or [with respect to goods that are] absent “In such-and-such a place I have various [pieces of] gold” (*hirañña-suvaṇṇa*), let this be for you”; whoever should accept [this] with his mind, not rejecting it verbally or physically, of this one it is said, *should accept* (*sādiyeyya*, Pāt 38,15).

¹ But if he accepts with his mind, being desirous of taking it, and rejects [it] physically or verbally, saying, “It is not lawful”, [or] even³ if not rejecting [it] physically or verbally, [later], becoming of pure mind, he does not accept [it, saying], “This is not lawful for us”,⁴ it is suitable.

To be forfeited (*nissaggiyam*, Pāt 38,15) means: [72] for him, if he does any [action such as] taking up, etc., with respect to objects not tightly bound, there is [an offence entailing] expiation with forfeiture in accordance with the number of objects.⁴ By him who forfeits [it], it is to

i-i Sp III 690,30–91,2

¹ These all are various types of money, subsumed under “money” (*rūpiyam*) later in this rule.

² *ugganhāti* means picking up or taking something up without it having been offered to him; it is the opposite of *patiganganhāti* “to formally accept”.

³ We follow the reading of C^e (Kkh 124, n. 9).

⁴ Sp III 690,24ff. explains that for each coin taken up an offence arises; if one takes one thousand coins, there arise offences in accordance with the number of objects (*vatthu-gananāya*), that is, one thousand offences. As part of a

⟨125⟩*Nissaggiyapācittiya 18 M*

245

be forfeited in the midst of the Saṅgha only¹ thus, ^j—“Venerable sirs, I formally accepted² money (*rūpiyam*). This is to be forfeited by me, venerable sirs. I forfeit this to the Saṅgha”.^j

³If any householder comes there, he is to be addressed [with the words], ^k—“You shuld know about this.”^k But if he says, ^a—“What should be brought with this?”,^a not having said, “Just this”, ^b—whatever is lawful is to be indicated^b thus, “Ghee, etc., are lawful for bhikkhus.” ^c—If he brings [that sort of thing] it is to be enjoyed by all of them, except for the one who formally accepted the money,^c having shared it out. But for the one who formally accepted the money, ⟨125⟩ it is not suitable to enjoy whatever accrued by means of that [money], even that which was given by another one who had received the [money, and] even the shade of a tree which came into existence because of that [money].⁴

But if [the housholder] does not wish to bring anything (i.e. for the money he initially brought), he is to be spoken to [with the words], ^d—“Throw it (i.e. the money) away.”^d If he throws it somewhere or other,

^{j-j}Vin III 238,12f. ^{k-k}≠ Vin III 238,16 ^{a-a}Vin III 238,16f. ^{b-b}Vin III 238,18
^{c-c}≠ Vin III 238,19 ^{d-d}Vin III 238,22

quotation from Mahāpaccarī and Kurundī, Sp further explains that in case the objects are tightly bound (*ghāṇa-baddhe*) or tightly filled in (*ghāṇa-pūrīte*), only one offence arises.

¹ Normally things can be forfeited to a Saṅgha, a group (*gāṇa*) or an individual (*puggala*). Money, however, since it is unlawful (*akappiya*), has to be forfeited in the presence of the Saṅgha (Kkh-nt 323,1f.: *saṅghamajjhe yeva nissajjītabban ti* (Kkh 124,22f.) *yasmā rūpiyam nāma akappiyam, tasmā nissajjītabbam saṅghassa vā ganassa vā puggalassa vā ti na vuttam).*

“**It is to be forfeited in the midst of the Saṅgha only** means: Because silver [that is, money] is unlawful, there, it is not said [here in this rule], ‘It is to be forfeited to the Saṅgha, a group, or an individual.’”

² *paṭiggahesi*; it is strange that in the formula with which the objects are forfeited the verb used is *paṭiggāhāti*, “to formally accept”, since in the Pātimokha rule the term *uggāhāti*, “to take up” is used.

³ Normally, the objects which are forfeited by a bhikkhu are given back to him afterwards. In the case of money, however, the forfeited coins are given to an *ārāmika**, a lay follower (Vin III 238,15) or a householder (*gahāttha*, Kkh 124,24). Thus, the commentary here describes with which words one is allowed to hand the money over to such a lay person.

⁴ Cf. Sp III 692,1–12, and von Hinüber’s translation (2006: 18 [2009: 884]).

246 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture* (125)

or if he goes, taking it with him, he is not to be prevented. ^eIf he does not throw it away, a bhikkhu possessed of five qualities¹ is to be agreed upon as the one who throws the money away.^{e f}Making no sign at all^f(i.e. not noting where it falls), it is to be thrown away by him like excrement. ^gIf he makes a sign, he commits [an offence of] wrong doing.^g

[This rule] was prescribed at Rājagaha (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Upananda (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter of formally accepting silver (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.² It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking it is money when it is not money or for one who is in doubt,³ for one taking it for the sake of the Saṅgha, the *cetiya*, etc., and in the formal acceptance of pearls, jewels, etc.⁴ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one depositing it in the manner [taught in] the rule about jewels (*ratana-sikkhāpada*, Pāc 84 M),⁵ and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) the existence of gold and silver, (ii) being destined to himself, (iii) the existence of one or other among taking, etc. (= 9. *constituent factors*).

^{e–e}Vin III 238,23f. ^{f–f}≠ Vin III 238,36f. ^{g–g}≠ Vin III 238,37f.

¹ Kkh-nṭ 323,11–14: **pañcaṅgasamannāgato** (Kkh 125,5) “yo na chandāgatim gaccheyya, na dosāgatim gaccheyya, na mohāgatim gaccheyya, na bhayāgatim gaccheyya, chadditāchadditañ ca jāneyyā” ti (Vin III 238,24–27) evam vuttapañcaṅgehi samannāgato. “One possessed of five qualities [means] one possessed of the five qualities described thus: ‘one who would not follow a wrong course through desire, one who would not follow a wrong course through hatred, one who would not follow a wrong course through stupidity, one who would not follow a wrong course through fear, and one who would know what is thrown away and what is not thrown away.’”

² Vin III 239,1–4 (BD II 105).

³ Vin III 239,5f. (BD II 105).

⁴ These latter cases are not listed in the casuistry of this rule.

⁵ Laying aside a treasure or what is considered a treasure thinking that it will be returned to the original owner belongs to the non-offence formula of Pāc 84 M (Vin IV 164,5–9).

⟨126⟩*Nissaggiyapācittiya 19 M*

247

In respect of the origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., ^h-it may [originate in] activity from the committing [of the offence] by taking; it may [originate in] inactivity from the not rejecting (= 11. activity).^{-h}

The remainder is of exactly the [same] manner [as] stated in [the rule about] a go-between (Sgh 5 M).¹

The commentary on the rule about gold is finished.

[9. The commentary on the rule about money transactions]

[19. Niss M: *If any bhikkhu should engage in various kinds of money transactions, there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture.*

(Pāt 38,18f. = Vin III 239,28f.)]

In the ninth [rule] ⁱ-various kinds (*nānappakārakam*, Pāt 38,18) means: of various sorts by virtue of being made, etc.

Money transactions (rūpiyasamvohāram, Pāt 38,18) means: exchanging silver and gold.⁻ⁱ Formally accepting objects [coming under offences entailing] forfeiture and objects [coming under offences of] wrong-doing is avoided by the previous rule (Niss 18 M). By the [present] rule, exchanging [is avoided]. Therefore, there is [an offence of] wrong doing for one (1) exchanging objects [coming under an offence of] wrong doing as well as lawful objects for an object [coming under an offence of] wrong doing, and (2) [exchanging] an object [coming under an offence of] wrong doing for a lawful object.

But it is [an offence entailing] forfeiture (1) for one exchanging an object [coming under an offence entailing] forfeiture or an object [coming under an offence of] wrong doing or a lawful object for an object [coming under an offence entailing] forfeiture, and (2) [for one exchanging] an object [coming under an offence entailing] forfeiture for an object [coming under an offence of] wrong doing and a lawful object. **⟨126⟩** That is to be forfeited in the midst of the Saṅgha exactly in accordance with the former manner,² and with respect to a forfeited object, it is to

^{h-h}Sp III 696,16f. ⁱ⁻ⁱSp III 696,23f.

¹ This means, it has no acquittal due to lack of awareness (= 12. *awareness*); is not dependent on intention (= 13. *intention*); the offence against this rule is “a fault according to a precept laid down by the Buddha” (= 14. *fault*); it is a physical and a verbal deed (= 15. *deeds*); there are three types of thought (= 16. *thoughts*) and feelings (= 17. *feelings*).

² That is, with the one described in Niss 18 M.

248 Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture (126)

be acted on in exactly the manner stated there.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter of money transactions (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

These are the two constituent factors here: (i) being money [of that] which he exchanges for his own resources, or [being money] of [his own] resources, (ii) and the exchanging (= 9. *constituent factors*). [73]

[The offence originates in] activity (= 11. *activity*).

The remainder is of exactly the [same] manner [as] stated in the immediately preceding rule (Niss 18 M).

The commentary on the rule about money transactions is finished.

[10. The commentary on the rule about buying and selling]

[20. Niss M: *If any bhikkhu should engage in various kinds of buying and selling, there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture.*

(Pāt 38,21f. = Vin III 241,27f.)]

In the tenth [rule] ^j-*various kinds* (*nānappakārakaṁ*, Pāt 38,21) means: several kinds by virtue of lawful goods such as robes.^j

^k-*Buying and selling* (*kayavikkayam*, Pāt 38,21) means: buying and selling (resolution of compound). For, [saying,] “Give this for that.^{-k} Bring, exchange, barter this”, ^a-in this way taking the lawful goods from someone, one engages in buying. Giving one’s own lawful goods, one engages in selling.^{-a}

Therefore, ^b-except for the five co-religionists,^{-b} for whatever lawful goods of his own thus given he receives lawful goods [in return], even property of his mother, that is to be forfeited. By virtue of the characteristic stated,¹ it is to be forfeited to anyone in the Saṅgha, in a group, or to an individual [with the words,] “Having eaten or having

^{j-j}Sp III 699,27f.

^{k-k}Sp 699,31f.

^{a-a}Sp III 699,32–70,1

^{b-b}Sp 700,9

¹ According to Kkh-nt 324,21ff. this refers to Vin III 242,2ff.

⟨127⟩*Nissaggiyapācittiya 20 M*

249

taken this, bring me this or do [that]¹, either having caused dye, etc., to be brought, or having caused new [repair] work to be done such as requisites, e.g. regulation water-pots, and clearing the ground, etc., an existing object is to be forfeited, and if no [object] exists, only [the offence entailing] expiation is to be confessed.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Upananda, (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter of buying and selling (= 3. *subject matter*).

There is no offence for one asking the price thus, “How much is that worth?”; ^cfor one indicating, “Taking this for that, give it”, after having made another one ⟨127⟩ his legalizer, even his son or brother — except for him from whose hand he is desirous of taking goods; ^c for one taking something obtained with his own resources, saying thus, “This is ours, and we need this and that”; for one buying and selling with the five co-religionists, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) the state of being lawful objects of these [two, namely,] what he is exchanging from his own resources and what he is exchanging [it] for;² (ii) the state of not being a co-religionist, (iii) engaging in³ buying and selling (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The remainder is of exactly the manner stated in the [rule] about money transactions (Niss 19 M).

The commentary on the rule about buying and selling is finished.

The section about sheep's wool, the second.

^c—cSp III 702,1-4

¹ This is largely a summary of the more explicit version in Sp III 701,if.

² Compare the explanation of Vmv I 347,19: *yena yam parivatteti, tesam ubhinnam kappiyavatthutā ...* “What he is exchanging for what, the state of being lawful objects of these two ...”.

³ °āpajjanam here takes up *samāpajjati* — appearing in the rule itself, Vin III 241,27: *kayavikkayam samāpajjeyya* — from the beginning of the commentary (Kkh 126,17f.), for which Sp has *āpajjati* in the parallel passage with the variant *samāpajjati* (Sp III 699,33).

250 *Bhikkhupātimokha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture* ⟨128⟩

[III. The section about bowls]

[I. The commentary on the rule about bowls]

[21. Niss M: *An extra bowl may be kept for ten days at most. For one exceeding that, there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture.*

(Pāt 40,3f. = Vin III 243,5f.)]

In the first [rule] of the bowl section, *An extra bowl* (*atirekapatta*, Pāt 40,3) means: one not formally taken possession of and not formally assigned; and one or other of large, medium, or small, is of proper size indeed. Its size is spoken of in the text (that is, the Vinaya) in such manner as d—“it holds half an *ālhaka**¹ of boiled rice”—d

e—There, this is the regulation: taking two Magadha *nālis**² of unbroken³ old grains of rice which are clean and well husked, with those grains having cooked well cooked⁴ rice, [i.e. one that is] not grainy, not wet, not lumpy, [of a] bright white like a heap of buds of jasmine flowers; having thrown it into a bowl without remainder, some bean curry, prepared with all ingredients, not too thick, not too thin, able to be conveyed by hand, a quarter the size of that rice is to be thrown in; then a condiment of fish, meat, etc., suitable for that morsel [of rice], sufficient up to the last morsel, is to be thrown in; but butter, oil, buttermilk, sauce, gruel, etc., [74] do not come into the reckoning. For these are only accompaniments to the rice; they are not able to decrease or increase it. ⟨128⟩

Thus all of this thrown into [the bowl], if it stands level with the lowest line of the rim of the mouth of the bowl, or for one cutting with a

d—d Vin III 243,23 e—e Sp III 703,3–20

¹ This corresponds to between 2,250 and 4,400 grams or 4,355 and 8,460 grams.

² This corresponds to between 900 and 3500 gr., depending on the equation chosen.

³ *anupahata*^o; in Vin-vn-t I 331,13f. we read *sukoṭṭitānam akhaṇḍānam purāna-sālitandulānam*; *anupahata* “uninjured, unimpaired”, that is, unbroken, complete (DOP s.v. *upahata* “harmed, injured, impaired”) is probably replaced here by *akhaṇḍa*, “with no gaps, whole, entire, complete” (DOP s.v. *khaṇḍa*).

⁴ *avassāvita*; DOP s.v. “caused to boil over?” with one reference from Sp III 703,6, the parallel to the present passage. Cone determines the word as “caus. pp. of *ava* (+ *ā²*) + *savati*”. In the present context a perfectly boiled rice is described, which excludes the meaning “boiled-over rice” for *avassāvito-danam*. In Vin-vn-t I 331,16ff. the same adjectives are listed plus *avassāvitam*, and this is described as *supakkodanam*, “well-cooked rice”.

thread or splinter of wood it touches the lowest edge of the thread or splinter, this bowl is called “large”. If going beyond the line it stands heaped up, this bowl is called “the smallest of the large [bowls]” (*ukkaṭṭhomaka*). If it does not reach the line, but stays inside, this bowl is called “the largest of the large [bowls]”.^{1–e} Half the measure of a large bowl is “medium”. Half the measure of a medium bowl is “small”.² The variety of them too is to be understood exactly in the manner stated. Thus, among these nine, two [of them] — the very large (*or the largest of the large*) and the very small (*or the smallest of the small*), are non-bowls.³ The remaining seven bowls are called of proper small), are non-bowls.⁴ The remaining seven bowls are called of proper measure (i.e. size). This is a summary here; but the detailed [regulation] is stated in the *Samantapāśādikā*.⁵

Therefore having taken a bowl of the proper size thus, baked as befits a recluse (*samāna*), either an iron bowl or an earthenware bowl, having formally given up the old bowl, it is to be formally taken possession of within ten days.

If even a mere penny (*kākanika*)⁶ remains to be given from its purchase price, it is not suitable for being formally taken possession of; it is to be assigned by him not formally giving up [the old bowl]. There, the characteristics of formally giving up and formally taking possession of are to be understood exactly in the way stated in the section about

¹ The same differentiation is made with respect to a medium sized bowl (*majjhima patta*) and a small bowl (*omaka patta*).

² In Sp III 703,20ff. measures are given, namely two *nāli** for a large, one *nāli* for a medium sized, and half a *nāli* for a small bowl.

³ Because of their size they are not allowed as alms bowl (*patta*), but they may be used as vessels (Sp III 704,6f.: *ete bhājanaparibhogenā paribhuñjitabbā na adhiṭṭhānūpaga na vikappanūpaga*. “These are to be used according to the usage of vessels. They are neither suitable for being taken possession of formally nor suitable for assignment.”)

⁴ Because of their size they are not allowed as alms bowl (*patta*), but they may be used as vessels (Sp III 704,6f.: *ete bhājanaparibhogenā paribhuñjitabbā na adhiṭṭhānūpaga na vikappanūpaga*. “These are to be used according to the usage of vessels. They are neither suitable for being taken possession of formally nor suitable for assignment.”)

⁵ Sp III 703,23–704,14.

⁶ *kākanika*, “a small coin (worth less than half a *māsaka*).” DOP s.v.

252 Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture<129>

robes.¹ We shall speak of the characteristic of assignment later (see pp. 415ff.).

But if any bhikkhu without a bowl, having obtained ten bowls, is desirous of using them all himself, having formally taken possession of one bowl, on the next day, formally giving [it] up, another should be formally taken possession of [by him]. In this way it is possible to keep them for up to a hundred years.

But if one's bowl, starting from a space measuring two fingers' [breadth] (*aṅgula**) below the rim of the mouth, wherever should be broken [somewhere] with a hole of a size big enough for a lump of [boiled] millet to pass through, that is not fit for being formally taken possession of. The hole having been repaired again, it is to be formally taken possession of. The remainder of losing [its status of having been] formally taking possession of is of the exact manner stated in respect of the three robes (Niss 1 M).²

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter of using extra bowls (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

The sequence of the remaining explanation is to be understood exactly in the manner stated in the first³ rule of the section about robes⁴ (Niss 1 M).

The commentary on the rule about bowls is finished. <129>

[2. The commentary on the rule about less than five mends]

[22. Niss M: *If any bhikkhu should exchange a bowl with less than five mends for another new bowl, there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture. That [new] bowl is to be forfeited by that bhikkhu in the*

¹ *cīvara-vagga*, pp. 187–236.

² Above, pp. 192ff.

³ This rule is called *kathina-sikkhāpada* in Pāt 28.5, but *pāṭhama-kathina-sikkhāpada* in Sp III 650,30f. Whether the *pāṭhama-sikkhāpada* in the reference here simply is to be understood as a reference to the first rule of this section or whether it is short for *pāṭhama-kathina-sikkhāpada* is not clear.

⁴ *cīvara-vagga*; in Pāt 28.4 the editors followed the Burmese edition which has *kathina-vagga*. The fact that within the text *cīvara-vagga* is used shows, however, that this is the older name of that *vagga*.

⟨129⟩

Nissaggiyapācittiya 22 M

253

assembly of bhikkhus. And whichever is the last of the bowls of that assembly of bhikkhus is to be given to that bhikkhu [with the words], “Bhikkhu, this is your bowl; [it] is to be kept until it is broken.” This is the proper course here.

(Pāt 40,6–11 = Vin III 246,10–15)]

In the second [rule] f—“one with less than five mends”—f means: it has less than five mends. f—The meaning is that five mends of it are not completed; with [such a] one with less than five mends (*ūnapañcabandhanena*, Pāt 40,6). [This is] the instrumental case with respect to the characteristic of [one] being thus.¹ There, since even for [a bowl] without [any] mend, five mends are not completed because of there being absolutely none, f—therefore, it is stated in the Word Analysis on it, g—“A bowl with less than five mends is a bowl without a mend or with one mend, etc.”, g h—and because it is said with less than five mends (*ūna-pañca-bandhanena*, Pāt 40,6), [therefore,] he who has a bowl with five mends^h or with gaps for five mendsⁱ—has a non-bowl. Therefore it

f-fSp III 707,30–34 g-gVin III 246,17f. h-hSp III 708,1f. i-iSp III 708,2f.

¹ Kkh-nṭ 327,2–7: *tena ūnapañcabandhanenā ti* (Kkh 129,9) *tena ūnapañcabandhanena pattena upalakkhito hutvā ti attho. ūnapañcabandhano hi patto ettha lakkhaṇabhāvena gahito. ten’ evāha itthambhūtassā lakkhaṇe karanya-vacanan ti* (Kkh 129,10). *tattha itthambhūtassā ti* (Kkh 129,10) *kañci pakāraṇī pattassa. lakkhiyate anenā ti lakkhaṇam* (Kkh 129,10), *tasmin karanyavacanam* (Kkh 129,10), *tatiyāvibhattī ti attho.* “With [such a] one with less than five mends, the meaning is: as one characterised by ‘with that bowl with less than five mends’. For a bowl with less than five mends is grasped here by [its] characteristic. Exactly, therefore, [the author of Kkh] says: [This is] the instrumental case with respect to the characteristic of [one] being thus. There, of one being thus means: whatever sort of bowl. Characterised by that means: characteristic; with respect to that [there is] the instrumental case, the meaning is: the inflection of the third case.” For similar explanations, see Sekhiya section, below, p. 516, n. 2.

² *okāsa* in *bandhanokāsa* refers to a fissure or crack. This can be deduced from Vin III 246,19f, where a bowl with a fissure not to be mended (*abandhanokāsa*) is defined as one with a crack (*rāji*) of less than two *aṅgula** (about 3.6 cm), whereas a bowl with a fissure to be mended is defined as one with a crack of two *aṅgulas* or more. IBH misunderstood *rāji* as referring to the rim of a bowl (BD II 121). Obviously, cracks smaller than two *aṅgula* could not be mended. The method for mending a bowl described above in Kkh, therefore, starts with a two *aṅgula* crack.

254 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture*⟨130⟩

is suitable [for him] to ask for another [bowl].⁻ⁱ But in whatever bowl even a single crack of [the length of] two fingers' [breadth] (*aṅgula**) stretches¹ below the rim of the mouth — [75] ^j—having pierced the [bowl] at the lowest end of that crack with a bowl-piercer, having baked it, having mended it with thread-rope and fibre-rope, etc., or with a thread of tin — that mend is to be covered up with a plate of tin or some sort of gum (*silesa*),² etc., fastened on so that food will not stick to it. And that bowl is to be used after having formally taken possession of it. Or having made a small hole, it is to be mended.^{-j} ^kHaving cooked sugar syrup (*phāṇita*)³ it is suitable to also mend it with powdered stone.^{-k}

^a—But whichever bowl has two cracks or only one of [the length of] four fingers' [breadth] (*aṅgula**), two mends must be given to that one. One which has three cracks or only one of [the length of] six fingers' [breadth] (*aṅgula**), to that one, three [mends must be given]. One which has four cracks or only one of [the length of] eight fingers' [breadth], to that one, four [mends must be given]. One which has five [cracks] or only one of [the length of] ten fingers' [breadth], that one, whether mended or not mended, is a non-bowl. Another [bowl] is to be asked for. This, first of all, is the regulation in respect of clay bowls. ⟨130⟩

But in respect of an iron bowl, even if there are five or more holes, if they have been mended with iron powder, or a pin, or a copper circle, [and] they are smoothed, [such] a one indeed is to be used. Another one is not to be asked for. But if there is only one large hole, even mended with a copper circle [but] not smoothed, food sticking to the bowl, it is not lawful (*akappiya*); this is a non-bowl. Another one must be asked for.^{-a}

But whoever asks for another one when there is either an iron bowl coming under the general heading “bowl” (i.e. being called a bowl, and not a non-bowl) or a clay bowl with less than five mends, there is [an offence of] wrong doing in [his] action. By [the very act of] receiving [it] it is to be forfeited.⁴ [The bowl] is to be forfeited. By him who

^{j-j}Sp III 708,8–13 ^{k-k}Sp III 708,14f. ^{a-a}Sp III 708,17–28

¹ *bhatṭha*; not used in this meaning elsewhere according to our dictionaries.

² For *silesa*, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 227].

³ *phāṇita* is a sugar product (Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 170]). It is generally translated by “molasses” in secondary literature. Here the cooking of *phāṇita* obviously has the aim to function as a glue for the powdered stone.

⁴ *nissaggiyam*. In the present case the fact that the bowl is to be forfeited is

130*Nissaggiyapācittiya 22 M*

255

forfeits it, it is to be forfeited in the midst of the Saṅgha, therefore it is said, *it is to be forfeited in the assembly of bhikkhus (bhikkhuparisāya nissajitabbo, Pāt 40.8).*

And whichever [is the last of the bowls] of that assembly of bhikkhus (yo ca tassā bhikkhuparisāya, Pāt 40.8): here, the bhikkhus have to assemble, each, as usual, having taken his own bowl which has been formally taken possession of. Then a bowl-taker agreed upon, having stated the actual quality of that bowl (i.e. the one that has been forfeited)¹ should address the eldest² [of the assembly saying,] “Sir, take this.” If that bowl does not seem good to the elder, or if he does not take it because of little desire, it is suitable. But if he does not take it from sympathy for the [bhikkhu who owned it before], there is [an offence of] wrong doing. But if he takes it, having caused the second eldest to take the bowl of the eldest (i.e. his own bowl), in that very way [each one] should be caused to take [the bowl of the next person in descending rank] down to the youngest of the Saṅgha. The bowl abandoned by that [last one], however, is called “the last of the bowls”. That is to be given to that bhikkhu. The bowl he has received should be used carefully by him, as though having asked for it. But if being ashamed of it he either puts it down in a non-place (that is, an unsuitable place), or uses it for a non-use (that is, an unsuitable use), or gives it away, he commits [an offence of] wrong doing.

[This rule] was prescribed in the Sakka [country]³ (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six, (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter of asking for many bowls (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

mentioned separately (*nissajitabbo*, Kkh 130.8), which amounts to a duplication of the rule. There is one other rule where we have a similar duplication, see above, p. 220, n. 1.

¹ Kkh-nt 328,7ff. mentions: the right size, its being beautiful, and that it is appropriate for the elder.

² Literally, only the (or an) elder is spoken of. Since, however, the eldest of the assembly is the first to be asked, we translate “the eldest” here.

³ For the plural expressions of specific countries, see Pind 2008.

256 Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture<131>

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. command).

For an unmended bowl he exchanges (i) an unmended bowl, (ii) one with one mend, (iii) two mends, (iv) three mends, (v) four mends, (vi) one with no gap for mends, (vii) one with a gap for one, (viii) two, (ix) three, (x) or four mends, thus a tenfold bowl, ten times for each individual bowl. But by virtue of exchanging, there is [a group of] one hundred [offences entailing] expiation with forfeiture (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one who has lost a bowl, for one whose bowl is broken, if one is invited by his own relatives,¹ and if one is invited by someone else's relatives, for one asking only on his behalf, for one acquiring [a bowl] with his own resources, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

<131> These are the four constituent factors here: (i) the state of having less than five mends in a bowl which is suitable for being formally taken possession of, (ii) being destined to himself, (iii) a request without a [prior invitation] having been made,² [76] (iv) and receiving [it] by means of this [request] (= 9. constituent factors).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are exactly of the manner³ stated in the rule of training about causing to be washed (Niss 4 M).

The commentary on the rule about less than five mends is finished.

[3. The commentary on the rule about medicines]

[23. Niss M: *There are medicines to be eaten by bhikkhus who are ill, namely, ghee, fresh butter, oil, honey, sugar syrup. Having formally accepted them, they are to be used, storing them up for seven days at most. For one exceeding that, there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture.*

(Pāt 40,13-17 = Vin III 251,14-18)]

¹ Vin III 248,7 has simply *ñātakānam*; Kkh-pṭ 87,5f. and Kkh-nṭ 328,19 explain °pavārite by *pavāritatthāne*, “at a place [to which] one is invited”.

² For *akata-viññatti* two resolutions are suggested in commentarial literature: “without a request having been made” or “a request without a [prior invitation] having been made”. The latter is the more common, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I [Z 97].

³ Kkh 131,3; 135,5, etc. (see Kkh, Index, s.v. *vuttanayān'* [evā]); in Kkh 120,8 (Niss 11) which for the rest is identical the text reads *vuttanayen'* evā; it cannot be excluded that in both cases the same form was used originally.

In the third [rule] ^b—*to be eaten* (*paṭisāyanīyāni*, Pāt 40,₁₃) means: to be eaten (*paṭisāyatabbāni*; alternative form); the meaning is to be eaten (*paribhuñitatabbāni*; alternative verb).^b By this [the text of the Pātimokkha] shows the non-offence, even in exceeding seven days, for deposited things, having taken them oneself. For to eat them is not suitable.

^c—*Medicines* (*bhesajjāni*, Pāt 40,₁₄) means: [things] having this conventional designation, whether they do the work of medicines or not.^c

Ghee (*sappi*, Pāt 40,₁₄) means: ghee from cows, etc.¹ The ghee of those animals whose meat is lawful. Similarly with fresh butter.

Oil (*telam*, Pāt 40,₁₄) means: what is produced from sesamum, mustard [seeds], honey-tree [seeds]², castor oil [seeds], tallow, etc.³

Honey (*madhu*, Pāt 40,₁₄) means: only honey from bees.

Sugar syrup (*phānita*, Pāt 40,₁₅) means: ^d—each and every derivative of sugar cane based on sugar cane juice — whether unboiled or boiled without solid components^d — is to be understood as “sugar syrup”.

Having formally accepted them (*tāni paṭiggahetvā*, Pāt 40,₁₅) means: having formally accepted these medicines, not their bases. By this, [the text of the Pātimokkha] shows that, except for oil from tallow (?), having formally accepted the bases of those things [allowed during the time period] up to the [right] time (*yāva-kālikā*), e.g. ghee, etc., which have [already] been made, there is no offence even for one exceeding seven days.⁴

But “[boiled] oil from tallow”⁵ (*vasātela*) formally accepted at the [right] time, boiled at the [right] time, mixed at the [right] time, is

^{b–b}Sp III 710,6f. ^{c–c}Sp III 710,7ff. ^{d–d}Sp III 715,28f.

¹ The “etc.” refers to other animals from whose milk ghee can be obtained. These are those animals whose flesh may also be eaten under certain conditions. Explicitly named are cows, goats (*ajikā*), and buffaloes (*mahisa*, Vin III 251,20ff.). But actually, all animals whose flesh does not belong to the prohibited sorts (elephant, horse, dog, snake, lion, tiger, panther, bear, and harpy) should be allowed. For more details, see Schmithausen 2000: 164ff.; Schmithausen 2005: 189; Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I [Z 127].

² *madhūka*. This tree is called honey- or butter-tree (*Bassia latifolia*).

³ The Vinaya also lists these five types of oil, Vin III 251,23; V 129,5f.

⁴ Thus the rule explicitly refers to the manufactured medicines only, not to the basic substances from which they are derived.

⁵ *vasā-tela*, “oil from tallow”, is listed as one of five types of oil in Vin III 251,23 (Niss 23). In the present case, the *vasā* first has to be cooked to produce oil. So here, *vasātela* is to be understood as “[boiled] oil from tallow”.

258 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture* (132)

allowed to be used following the usage of oil.¹ Therefore, except for human tallow, having formally accepted any other tallow whatsoever, before the meal (i.e. before noon), having boiled [it] oneself,² (132) even the oil produced [from it] is suitable for seven days following the usage of [things] not mixed with food.³ But whatever is given by an unordained person after having boiled it, is suitable even with other food before the meal (i.e. before noon) that very day. It is not at all suitable to boil one thing among the other things [allowed during the time period] up to the [right] time (*yāva-kālīka*). It is suitable to boil ghee which has been produced or fresh butter, but it is not suitable to eat that with other food even before the meal (i.e. noon) that very day.

But ghee, and so on, made by an unordained person, having it boiled from milk, and so on, which had been formally accepted before the meal (i.e. noon), are suitable even with other food before the meal that very day.

Starting from after the meal (i.e. noon), they are not to be consumed. There is no offence, even in exceeding seven days.

They are to be used, storing them up (sannidhikārakam paribhuñjī-tabbāni, Pāt 40,15f.) means: having stored, having deposited [them], things formally accepted before the meal (i.e. noon) are suitable even according to the use with other food before the meal (i.e. noon) that day. But starting after the meal (i.e. noon), those things and the things formally accepted after the meal (i.e. noon) may be used for seven days according to the use without other food. That is the meaning. And because of the word[s] “they are to be used”, there is no offence in respect of [things] deposited after having determined them, for the sake of ointments, etc., within seven days.

¹ This goes back to Vin I 200,23–26, where it is allowed to use tallows as medicines if they are formally accepted, cooked, and mixed at the right time and used according to the use of oil (*telaparibhogena paribhuñjītum*), which means that in using tallows one has to follow the guidelines for oil. This last point has been misunderstood by Rhys Davids and Oldenberg who translate it as “to be partaken of with oil” (*VinTexts* II 43), and by IBH, who translates “by using them with oil” (*BD* IV 270).

² *sāmam pacati*, “boiling [something] oneself”.

³ The guidelines for what is not mixed with food (*nirāmisa*) are described at some length in Sp III 714.9ff.

⟨132⟩*Nissaggiyapācittiya 23 M*

259

Having formally accepted things [allowed] during life, such as mustard [seeds], honey-tree [seeds], castor seeds, and bones for the sake of making oil, oil made on that very day is suitable for a period of seven days; made on the second day, it is suitable for six days; made on the third day, for five days; made on the fourth, fifth, sixth, [or] seventh day, it is suitable on that very day.¹ If it stands until the rising of the sun, it is to be forfeited. Made on the eighth day it is not to be consumed, but because it is not to be forfeited it is suitable for external applications.

If he does not make [oil], [77] he commits [an offence of] wrong doing in exceeding seven days with respect to mustard seeds, etc., [that are] formally accepted for the sake of oil and with respect to the [type of] ghee, etc., not transmitted (i.e. not mentioned) in the text (that is, Vinaya). But the sugar syrup (*phānita*) produced by means of cold water from the flower of the honey-tree² belongs to the class of sugar syrups. Sugar syrups from mangos, etc., are [allowed during the time period] up to the [right] time (i.e. up to noon).

But whatever [object] here (i.e. in this rule) belongs to [the things allowed] during seven days, [if] that has been forfeited, even after one has received it [again], it is not suitable to smear [it] on wounds, etc., or to consume it. ^eIt is to be put into an oil lamp^e or into black colour.³ It is suitable for the bodily use of another bhikkhu.⁴ But whatever one gets back, having abandoned it unheedingly, it is suitable even to consume that. In respect of ghee, etc., separately deposited,⁵ or in respect of things not mixed together in one receptacle, offences [arise] in accordance with the number of items.

^e–^eVin III 252,4f.

¹ Here only the day of usage related to the seventh day of receiving it is mentioned. Regarding things received on the fourth, fifth, and sixth days, the days of usage have to be added in conformity with the preceding three examples.

² For the production of this type of *phānita*, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II 1138.

³ Cf. Vin III 252,4f. (BD II 133).

⁴ Paraphrase of Vin III 252,5f. (BD II 133).

⁵ Most probably this refers to cases where food that is lawful becomes unlawful by being combined with ghee that has been deposited, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: III [Z 354].

260 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture* (133)

(133) [This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning many bhikkhus (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter of exceeding seven days (= 3. *subject matter*).

The remainder is to be understood exactly in the manner stated in the first rule in the section about robes (Niss 1 M).

The commentary on the rule about medicines is finished.

[4. The commentary on the rule about rains robes]

[24. Niss M: *By a bhikkhu [thinking], “A month of the hot weather is left”, material for a rains robe is to be sought. Having made it, it is to be worn [by him thinking], “Half a month of the hot weather is left.” Should he seek material for a rains robe, [thinking], “More than a month of the hot weather is left”, and should he, having made it, wear it [thinking], “More than half a month of the hot weather is left”, there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture.*

(Pāt 40,19–24 = Vin III 252,25–53,3)]

In the fourth [rule] f—a month of the hot weather is left (*māso seso gimhānam*, Pāt 40,19) means: one last month of the four months of the hot season is left.^f

[Material for a rains robe] is to be sought (*pariyesitabbam*, Pāt 40,20) means: from the first day of the last month of the hot season up to the last day of the month of Kattika, for so long [material for a rains robe] is to be sought by arousing [people’s] memory [with such words as g—“It is] the time for the rains robe”;^g but from a place to which the Saṅgha is invited [and] from a place to which one is invited by one’s own relatives, it is to be sought even by asking with such words as h—“Give me a rains robe.”^h¹ For one arousing [people’s] memory in a

f—fSp III 719,28ff. g—gVin III 253,6f. h—hVin III 253,8f.

¹ This speech actually belongs to the formulations a bhikkhu should not use (Vin IV 253,8f.). But as Kkh explains, they are lawful at places to which one is invited as a member of the Saṅgha or as a relative. Though this is not listed in the non-offence clause to Niss 24 M, this results from Niss 6 M, which makes it an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture if a bhikkhu asks a male or female householder who is not a relative for something. In the non-offence clause to this rule, relatives and invited persons are explicitly excluded from the rule. This is explained in more detail at Sp III 720,23ff.

⟨I34⟩*Nissaggiyapācittiya 24 M*

261

| place of non-relatives and of those who have not given an invitation,
| there is [an offence of] wrong doing in breaking the rules of conduct.¹
| For one asking in some way or other with such words as “Give me”,
| there is [an offence entailing] expiation with forfeiture according to the
| rule about asking from a non-relative (*Niss 6 M*).
|

| *Having made it, it is to be worn (katvā nivāsetabbam, Pāt 40,20f)*
| means: from the first day of the last half month of the hot season up to
| the last day of the month of Kattika, for so long it should be put on after
| the sewing work is finished, after dyeing [it] even once merely to
| change the colour, and after applying the legalizing dot was done. Thus
| the [following] meaning is shown: The last month of the hot season is a
| [time] period for seeking [robe material for a rains robe], the last half of
| the month is a [time] period for making and wearing [the rains robe]
| during the four months of the rains — all this² is suitable. ⟨I34⟩

| And herein, in that last month of the hot season which is permitted,³
| it is not suitable to formally take possession of the rains robe, even if it
| has [already] been sought and made. If the rains [retreat] is postponed
| when this month has passed,⁴ again he gets protection⁵ for one month;
| but having washed and deposited it, ⁱ-[the rains robe] is to be formally

| ⁱ-ⁱSp III 722,1–7

¹ In places of non-relatives and places to which one is not invited and where people did not previously give material for the rains robe to the bhikkhus, there exists the rule of conduct that one is not allowed to remind the inhabitants of the need of material. Thus, if a bhikkhu reminds them of his needs, he transgresses this rule of conduct. In the same place, but with inhabitants who previously had already given material to the bhikkhus, there does not exist a rule of conduct, and, therefore, bhikkhus reminding them do not commit an offence. This is stated explicitly in Sp III 721,10ff, to which also Kkh-nt 333,^{12–17} refers for the explanation of the present passage.

² This comprises seeking, making, and wearing. For more details, see Kieffer-Püllz 2013: II [Z 173].

³ Permitted for the actions connected with creating a rains robe.

⁴ For more details, see Kieffer-Püllz 2013: II [Z 174] and n. 6.

⁵ *parihāra*, either to be understood as protection from offences which otherwise would be committed (Kieffer-Püllz 2013: II [Z 177] n. 95) or exemption from rules normally to be observed (von Hinüber 2004: 807 [2009: 962]; Bronkhorst 2011: 88, 92 based on Olivelle 2005: 303 m.7.201). From the point of view of content the result is the same.

262 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture* (134)

taken possession of on the day of entering the rains [retreat]. If out of forgetfulness or because of insufficiency [of material, the rains robe] is not made, he gets protection for six months, [namely,] those two months and the four months of the rains. But if the *kathina* cloth is spread out in the month of Kattika, he gets [protection] for another four months,¹ thus there are ten months in total. After that, there being hope [to receive robe material]² having turned this (i.e. the material insufficient for a robe) into a basic robe³ he, depositing it,⁴ gets [protection] for one month. Thus he gets protection for eleven months in all.^{—i} Beyond that he does not get [protection] for a single day.

If more than [78] one month of the hot season remains (orena ce māso seso gimhānam, Pāt 40,21) means: sooner than the last month of the hot season up to the first day of the cold season, so long, [that is] the meaning.

Should he seek (pariyeseyya, Pāt 40,22) means: There is [an offence entailing] expiation with forfeiture for one seeking [robe material] by arousing [people's] memory from the place of non-relatives and those

¹ The *kathina* period lasts for four months at most, and is a prolongation of the last month of the rainy season during which robes are donated. With the spreading of the *kathina* robe this period is opened.

² This refers to Niss 3 M dealing with the case of a bhikkhu receiving robe material only after the *kathina* period has been closed. If that material is not sufficient for a robe, but there is expectation that the deficiency may be supplied, the bhikkhu is allowed to store the material he has for at most one month. See above, pp. 214f.

³ *tato param pi satiyā paccasāya tam* (Sp om.) *mūlacīvaram katvā ṭhapentassa ekamāsan ti*. The parallel in Sp III 722,6f. reads only *mūlacīvaram* *katvā*, while Kkh has *tam mūlacīvaram* *katvā*. Thus the text of Kkh renders probable that *tam*, standing for the robe material obtained but not yet sufficient for a robe, is turned into a *mūlacīvaram*. This is corroborated by Vmv I 355,26–356,2: *ekamāsan ti hemantassa pacchimuposathena saha gaṇetvā vuttam*. *tasmin uposathadivase eva hi tam mūlacīvaram kātabbam*, *itarathā hi nissaggiyato*. “One month is said by counting [the time] together with the last observance day of the winter. For on that very observance day that [robe material] has to be turned into a basic robe, for otherwise it is to be forfeited.”

⁴ The necessity to deposit that robe results from Niss 3 M, where the verb *nikkhipati* is used (Pāt 28,19f.).

⟨134⟩*Nissaggiyapācittiya 24 M*

263

|who have not given an invitation in the seven off-peak months.¹ For one
|asking [for robe material from such places],² there is [an offence entail-
|ing] expiation with forfeiture according to the rule about asking a non-
|relative (Niss 6 M). For one asking relatives and those who have given
|an invitation, there is no offence according to that rule (i.e. Niss 6 M).
|For one arousing [people's] memory, there is an offence according to
>this rule (Niss 24 M).³

|More than half a month of the hot weather is left (*oren' addhamāso*
seso gimhānam, Pāt 40,²²) means: in one half month sooner than in the
last half month of the hot season.

|Having made it, should wear it (*katvā nivāseyya*, Pāt 40,²³) means:
even though it has accrued lawfully, there is forfeiture for one wearing
it, after making it in this period (i.e. before the last half month of
summer).⁴

|[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning
the group of six bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject
matter of seeking a rains robe (= 3. *subject matter*).

|[The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

¹ *pīṭhi-samaya*, lit. “back time” stands for off-peak time, and describes the seven months starting with the first day after the full moon of the month of Kattika (the full-moon day that marks the end of the rains [retreat]), and ending with the full-moon day of the month of Jetṭhamūla. The remaining five months are described as *kucchi-samaya*, lit. “belly time” which stands for peak time, and refers to the time period beginning with the second first day (that is, with the first day of the second half of the month) of the month of Jetṭhamūla and ending with the full-moon day of the month of Kattika. For these definitions, see Sp III 720,23ff.; 721,8ff.; for details, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 177] n. 70.

² The *appavārita-tthānato* of the preceding sentence also applies to the present one. This is evident from Niss 6 M where places to which bhikkhus are invited are mentioned as exceptions in the *anāpatti* clause (Vin III 213,²², BD II 49). Thus, according to Niss 6 M an offence can only arise if one asks non-relatives and from places to which one is not invited.

³ Unlike Niss 6 M, the *anāpatti*-clause of Niss 24 M does not mention relatives and those who give invitations. Thus for this rule there is no special regulation regarding the places of relatives, etc.

⁴ Such a bhikkhu did make the rains robe outside the time segment intended for making the cloth, which is the last half month of summer, Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II 1174f.

264 Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture (134)

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. command).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ In the event of there being less than a month or half a month, it is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking there is more or for one who is in doubt.² Similarly, [there is an offence of wrong doing] for one who lets rain fall on his naked body [although] a rains robe is there³ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

But there is no offence for one bathing [naked] in lotus ponds,⁴ etc., or for one whose robe is stolen or lost,⁵ or for one putting on [his rains

¹ Actually six offences entailing expiation with forfeiture are listed, namely three for seeking (Vin III 253,23–27, BD II 136), and three for wearing (Vin III 253,28–32, BD II 136f.) the rains robe at the wrong time.

² Vin III 253,33ff. (BD II 137).

³ Vin III 253,32f. (BD II 137). According to the commentary this refers to the case that the water is raining from the sky, not for such cases where a bhikkhu sprinkles water on himself with a vessel (Kkh-nt 335,22ff.).

⁴ Kkh 134,26 reckons this case as belonging to the following non-offence cases. Neither Vin (III 254,3–10) nor Sp (III 723,4ff.) list it there. If it is taken to belong to that section, it remains unclear what exactly is the bhikkhu's action that is exempted from the rule. Thus it is more likely that the sentence *pokharaniyādisu pana nhāyatassa vā* belongs to the preceding case, and is another variant of exposing one's body to the rain while being naked, although a rains robe is there. But Kkh-nt explicitly states that this is the first case in the non-offence clause: "The [syntactical] relation is: But there is no offence for one bathing naked in lotus ponds, etc. The meaning is: there is no offence of wrong doing for one bathing naked in lotus ponds, etc., even though there is a rains robe." (Kkh-nt 335,25–28: *pokharaniyādisu pana naggassa nhāyatassa anāpatti ti sambandho, pokharaniyādisu pana satiyāpi vassikasātikāya naggassa nhāyatassa natthi dukkataṭpatti ti attho.*)

⁵ Sp understands *achinna-cīvara* as referring to the rains robe (Sp III 723,4–7: *acchinna-cīvaraśā ti* (Vin III 254,9) *etam vassikasātikām sandhāya vuttam, tesam hi naggānam kāyovassāpane anāpatti, ettha ca mahagghāni vassikasātikām nivāsetvā nahāyatassa corūpaddavo āpadā nāma, sesam ettha uttānam eva.* "For one whose robe is stolen, this is said regarding the rains robe. For there is no offence for the naked [bhikkhus] in letting rain fall on [their] bodies. And here for one bathing, having put on a costly rains robe, the assault of thieves is a disaster indeed. The rest is absolutely clear here."). This means that according to Sp there is no offence for a bhikkhu bathing naked when his rains robe is stolen or lost. Kkh-nt 336,2f. understands *acchinna-cīvaraśā* as referring to a bhikkhu's remaining clothes (*acchinna-cīvaraśā ti acchinna-sesacīvaraśā*), that is, to his regular robe, not to the rains robe. This

⟨135⟩*Nissaggiyapācittiya 25 M*

265

[robe (?)]¹ in case of disasters such as thieves robbing an undressed [bhikkhu of his robes],² and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

And here, first, these are the three constituent factors for the offence of seeking: (i) the fact that the rains robe is destined to himself, (ii) the fact of seeking on an improper occasion; ⟨135⟩ (iii) and receiving [it] by means of this [search].

These are the four constituent factors for the offence of wearing it: (i) the fact of having robes, (ii) the absence of a disaster, (iii) the fact of having his own rains robe, (iv) wearing it on an improper occasion (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., are exactly of the manner stated in the rule of training about causing to be washed (Niss 4 M).

The commentary on the rule about rains robes is finished.

[5. The commentary on the rule about taking robes away]

[25. Niss M: *If any bhikkhu should, having himself given a robe to a bhikkhu, [afterwards] being angry and displeased, take it away or have it taken away, there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture.*

(Pāt 42,2ff. = Vin III 255,5ff.)]

In the fifth [rule], *Himself having given a robe* (*sāmanī cīvaram datvā*, Pāt 42,2) means: having himself given, expecting services, etc.

also is the interpretation of the Sinhalese Ganṭhipadas quoted by Sāriputta (Sp-t II 439,29–440,1), and the Vmv I 357,13ff. Thus according to Kkh-nṭ, etc., a bhikkhu's regular robes are stolen or destroyed, and the bhikkhu then puts on the rains robe at an improper occasion. Though the improper occasion normally would lead to an offence, here it does not, because of the bhikkhu's plight. Kkh-nṭ 336,8ff. also discusses the reading of Sp which it considers incorrect, and so does Sāriputta who states that the Sp statement (*acchinna-cīvarassā ti etam vassikasātikam sandhāya vuttam*, see above) should not have been said.

¹ *nivāsayato*; normally used if a bhikkhu puts on his lower robe or the rains robe. If we assume that the robe stolen is the regular bhikkhu's robe, it should be his rains robe he is putting on, even on an improper occasion. This would fit the mention of this case in the non-offence clause of this rule. Following the interpretation of Sp the rains robe would have been stolen, thus in that case it should be the lower robe the bhikkhu is putting on. But this does not make sense as a case for the non-offence clause of this rule.

² For the commentarial discussion of this case, see Appendix 26.

266 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture*(135)

Should take [it] away (acchindeyya, Pāt 42,3) means: seeing him not doing any services, etc., for him, taking [it] away with the thought that they are his own [i.e. that they belong to him], there are offences in accordance with the number of objects (i.e. the number of robes given to the other bhikkhu).

Should cause to be taken away (acchindāpeyya, Pāt 42,3): here, however, there is [an offence of] wrong doing because of the command, "Take [it] away." However many commands there are in respect of taking away, there are offences in accordance with the number of them.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatti (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Upananda (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter of taking robes away (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking he is ordained when he is not ordained, for one who is in doubt, or for one thinking he is not ordained,² or for one taking away — even from an ordained person — any requisite other than a cloth having the smallest measure suitable for assigning [it to someone else],³ and anything from an unordained person⁴ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

¹ Vin III 255,21–26 (BD II 141).

² Vin III 255,30ff. (BD II 141). According to the regular way one has three variants with respect to one person: he is not ordained, and (i) the bhikkhu thinks he is ordained, (ii) is in doubt as to whether he is ordained, or (iii) thinks he is not ordained. Normally, in all three cases the same offence is specified. In the present rule with respect to the third option (someone is not ordained, and the bhikkhu acts, considering him to be not ordained) the text specifies an offence of wrong doing. IBH states “Here text is surely corrupt, for instead of āpatti dukkaṭassa it should read anāpatti. Oldenberg gives no variant reading” (BD II 141, n. 1). The fact that the commentary too teaches an offence of wrong doing here, shows that IBH’s assumption is wrong. This is further confirmed by the statement on the sorts of offences that one commits an offence of wrong doing in taking [any object] whatever from an unordained person (see above).

³ Vin III 255,26f. *vikappanupagapacchimacīvara*. See Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 210], etc.

⁴ Vin III 255,27ff. (BD II 141).

⟨136⟩*Nissaggiyapācittiya 26 M*

267

But what was given by one being joyful or angry, or [given] to one on trust for one taking [that] and for one who is insane, etc., there is no offence. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the five constituent factors here: (i) the fact of its being a cloth having the smallest measure suitable for assigning [it to someone else], (ii) the fact that it was given by himself, (iii) thinking that it is his own, (iv) the fact of being ordained, (v) the taking or causing to be taken by virtue of anger (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] taking what is not given (Pār 2 M), except for feeling.

But feeling (= 17. *feeling*) here is only unpleasant feeling (*dukkhā*).

The commentary on the rule about taking robes away is finished. ⟨136⟩

[6. The commentary on the rule about asking for thread]

[26. Niss M: *If any bhikkhu should, having himself asked for thread, have it woven into robe material by weavers, there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture.*

(Pāt 42,6f. = Vin III 256,27f.)] [79]

In the sixth [rule] *Thread* (*suttam*, Pāt 42,6) means: the six kinds of thread such as linen, or thread being in accordance with them.

Having asked (*viññāpetvā*, Pāt 42,6) means: having requested for the sake of cloth.

Should cause to weave (*vāyāpeyya*, Pāt 42,7) means: should cause to weave by the unlawful order, “Sir, weave a robe for me.”

[*Offence entailing*] *forfeiture* (*nissaggiyam*, Pāt 42,7) means: for the one thus causing it to be woven, whatever weaver for the sake of weaving cloth performs actions such as preparing the shuttle (*turi*), the loom (*vemi*), etc., there is [an offence of] wrong doing in respect of every one of the [weaver’s] actions. By [the very act of] receiving [it], it is to be forfeited.

[This rule] was prescribed at Rājagaha (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter of causing a robe to be woven (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

268 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture* (136)

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. command).

For the one causing the thread that was asked for to be woven by a weaver who was asked for,^j when it has been woven a span (*vidatthi*^{*}) in length and a cubit (*hattha*^{*}) in width there is [an offence entailing] expiation with forfeiture.^j Thus, as long as the robe material increases, for so long the offences increase in accordance with the measure [of the woven piece]. But as previously there was [an offence entailing] forfeiture for the one causing the thread obtained by him without asking to be woven, so too here, there is [an offence of] wrong doing. For one causing to be woven [a thread] asked for as well as unasked for by him, if ^kthe robe material is tied [in squares] like a cultivated field^k in accordance with the stated measurements,^l ^kthere is [an offence entailing] expiation regarding the section [of the woven fabric] consisting of unlawful threads, [and] similarly, [an offence of] wrong doing regarding the other [sections].^{2-k} If the sections are smaller than that, there are only [offences of] wrong doing for each section.^a Furthermore, if it has been woven with alternate threads or making it lawful lengthwise [and] unlawful crosswise,^{3-a} there are [offences of] wrong doing in accordance with counting the previously stated measure. In that very same way the sorts of offences are to be known in respect of unlawful threads by a lawful weaver, and even a thread which is lawful, or unlawful, or lawful and unlawful by weavers who are lawful and unlawful. There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.⁴ It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking it has been caused to be woven when it has not been caused to be woven, or for one who is in doubt⁵ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one asking for thread for the sake of sewing robes, a bandage, a body band, a shoulder strap, a bag for his bowl or a water strainer, for one causing lawful thread to be woven by relatives and those who have given an invitation, for the sake of another, or

^{j-j}Sp III 725,6f.

^{k-k}Sp III 725,21ff.

^{a-a}Sp III 725,25f.

¹ The idea is that the cloth consists of single sections of woven fabric bound together. Depending on the size of each such section it needs to be formally taken possession of. For details, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 176].

² That is, those made of lawful thread?

³ That is, by choosing an unlawful thread for the length and a lawful one for the width.

⁴ Vin III 257,5ff. (BD II 144).

⁵ Vin III 257,7ff. (BD II 144).

⟨I37⟩*Nissaggiyapācittiya 27 M*

269

[acquiring it] with his own resources, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) thread asked for for the sake of robe material, ⟨I37⟩ (ii) it being destined to himself, (iii) causing it to be woven by an unlawful weaver as a result of an unlawful request (= 9. constituent factors).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are exactly of the manner stated in the rule of training about causing to be washed (Niss 4 M).

The commentary on the rule about asking for thread is finished.

[7. The commentary on the rule about the great weaver]
[27. Niss M: *A householder or a householder's wife, not related [to the bhikkhu], may have robe material woven by weavers specifically for a bhikkhu. If there that bhikkhu, without being previously invited, having gone there to the weavers, should suggest an alternative, [saying], "Friends, this robe material is being woven specifically for me. Make it long and wide and firm and well woven and evenly woven and well scraped, and well combed; then perhaps we might give you, sirs, a little something", and if after having spoken thus he should give a little something, even merely [the contents of] an alms bowl, there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture.*]

(Pāt 42,10–19 = Vin III 259,5–14)]

In the seventh [rule] b—if there that bhikkhu (*tatra ce so bhikkhu*, Pāt 42,11f.) means: where in a village or market town there are weavers, there.^b

c—Without being previously invited (*pubbe appavārito*, Pāt 42,12) means: as one uninvited by the owners of the robe material.^c

d—Should suggest an alternative (*vikappam āpajjeyya*, Pāt 42,13) means: should put forward a special thought, an extra arrangement. Now the words “This, friends” (Pāt 42,13),¹ etc., are spoken to show in what way he has suggested that alternative.^d

There, long (*āyatam*, Pāt 42,14) means: long (*dīgham*).

Wide (*vitthataṁ*, Pāt 42,14) means: wide (*puthulam*).

e—Firm (*appitam*, Pāt 42,14) means: thick (*ghanam*).

^b–^bSp III 728,2f. ^c–^cSp III 728,8f. ^d–^dSp III 728,3–6 ^e–^eSp III 727,28–32

¹ Cf. Vin III 259,31.

270 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture* (138)

Well woven (*suvitam*, Pāt 42,14) means: well woven (resolution of compound), woven making it level [even] in all places.

Evenly woven (*suppavāyitam*, Pāt 42,15) means: well woven (resolution of compound), well set forth on the loom, making it level [even] in all places.

Well scraped (*suviilekhitam*, Pāt 42,15) means: well scraped with a scraper. (138)

Well combed (*suvitacchitam*, Pāt 42,15) means: [80] well combed (resolution of compound) with a comb. The meaning is well cleansed.^{–e}

Even merely [the contents of] an alms bowl (*pindapātamattam pi*, Pāt 42,18): and here it is to be forfeited not because of a bhikkhu merely giving alms food, but if because of his word, having taken thread from the hand of the owners of the robe material, they make it small or long or spread out or thick, then there is [an offence of] wrong doing for the bhikkhu in their action. By [the very act of] receiving [it], it is to be forfeited.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Upananda (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter of suggesting an alternative in respect of a robe (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking it is not a relative when it is a relative, or for one who is in doubt² (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one causing [a robe] to be woven by weavers among relatives and those who have given an invitation, for the sake of another, [acquiring it] with his own resources, or when he causes someone wishing to have an expensive robe woven to have a cheap one woven, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

These are the four constituent factors here: (i) Suggesting an alternative, having approached weavers among non-relatives and those who have not given an invitation, (ii) the fact that the robe is destined to

¹ Vin III 260,10–14 (BD II 150).

² Vin III 260,15f. (BD II 150).

⟨139⟩*Nissaggiyapācittiya 28 M*

271

himself, (iii) the increase of the thread because of his word, (iv) receiving the robe (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are exactly of the manner stated in the rule of training about causing to be washed (Niss 4 M).

The commentary on the rule about the great weaver is finished.

[8. The commentary on the rule about special robes]

[28. Niss M: *Should a special robe become available for a bhikkhu when the Kattika full moon [which comes at the end of the] three months [of the rainy season] has not come by ten days, it is to be received by that bhikkhu, thinking that it is special. Having received it, it is to be deposited until the season for robes. If he should deposit it for longer than that, there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture.*

(Pāt 42,21–25 = Vin III 261,20–24)]

In the eighth [rule] f—not come by ten days (*dasāhānāgatam*, Pāt 42,21) means: ten days (resolution of compound) [is] ten days (compound); not come by that ten days (resolution of compound) [is] not come by ten days (compound). The meaning is, not arrived by ten days. That is *not come by ten days*. This is the accusative case in the sense of the locative case by virtue of the uninterrupted connection [of time] (*accantasamyoga*).^{1-f} ⟨139⟩

g—The Kattika full moon [at the end of] three months (*Kattikatemāsikapūṇṇamam*, ≠ Pāt 42,21) means: the full-moon of the first Kattika [month]; here too the accusative case is in the sense of the locative exactly in the same manner as before (i.e. in the preceding word quoted from the commented text)f because the first phrase (i.e. “not come by ten days”, *dasāhānāgatam*) is not in the accusative [sense?]. The [following] is said [by this]: from that [full-moon day] onward [till] the first Invitation [day],² called [the one] that has not [yet] come by ten

f—f Sp III 728,13–17 g—g Sp III 728,20–29,1

¹ See Pind 1990: 181f., who links this with Skt *atyantasamyoga*, “uninterrupted connection”, and refers to Pāṇ II 3 [2+] 5.

² The first Invitation day is the full-moon day of the month Assayuja, also called earlier or first Kattika month. It concludes the earlier rains [retreat] (*purimavassa**). Since it is the regular period for spending the rains — the latter rains [retreat] (*pacchima-vassa**) is only in case one did not find a place for the

272 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture* (139)

days; even if during these days, during [this] uninterrupted [time period],¹ a special robe should occur for a bhikkhu, knowing “This is a special [robe]”, all that is to be formally accepted by that bhikkhu.² By this is shown the time for depositing the [special] robe which has occurred from the fifth day of the bright fortnight of the Invitation month onward (i.e. the month in which the Invitation takes place: Assayuja, also called “first Kattika”).³

Even though the [time for depositing] is actually effected by the [rule] “An extra robe is to be worn for ten days at most” (Niss 1 M, Pāt 28,6f. = Vin III 196,10), the [present] rule is established by virtue of the arising of the matter (i.e. the introductory story), however, showing that [legal] case as though unprecedented.^{—g}

Special robe (accekacīvaraṁ, Pāt 42,22) means: given by one or other of the individuals who are going on a journey or are ill or pregnant or with faith newly risen, thus announcing, “I will give a rains robe.” If it is shared out before the Invitation, [then] he, by whom it is taken, should not interrupt the rains [retreat]. If he interrupts it, that robe belongs to the Saṅgha.

rains residence in time — this Invitation is also called “the great Invitation” (*mahā-pavāraṇā*), see above, p. 33, n. 1.

¹ A special robe is defined in the Word Analysis to Niss 28 M as a robe the donor gives to bhikkhus of a rains residence during the last ten days of the rains [retreat] by sending a messenger who states, “Let the reverend sirs come, I will give a rains-residence [gift]” (*āgacchantu bhadantā, vassāvāśikam dassāmī ti*, Vin III 261,27–32, BD II 154). Alternatively it can be announced by “I will give a rains-residence [gift]” (*vassāvāśikam dassāmī ti*) if we follow Sp III 729,6f. Thus, the special robe is linked to the rains residence. As a result of this, a bhikkhu who leaves the rains residence during these ten days, after having received such a special robe, forfeits his right to the special robe, and the Saṅgha inhabiting the rains residence becomes the owner (Sp III 729,11–14 ≠ Kkh 139,13f.). *Accantam eva* explained by Kkh-nt as *nirantaram eva* “without interruption indeed” (Kkh-nt 340,17) refers to this time period of ten days before the Invitation ceremony takes place.

² Here ends the explanation of the meaning introduced by *idam vuttam hoti* (Kkh 139,3), and completed by *ti* (Kkh 139,6).

³ The half month after the full moon day is the bright fortnight. The fifth day of this bright fortnight is the tenth day before the Invitation day.

⟨140⟩*Nissaggiyapācittiya 29 M*

273

*Until the season for robes (yāva cīvarakālasamayam, Pāt 42,23f.) means: until the last month of the rains, when the *kathina* has not been spread out, up to five months, when the *kathina* [robe] has been spread out.¹ For so long it may be deposited.*

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning many bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter of exceeding the robe-time for a special robe (= 3. *subject matter*).

The remainder is to be understood here exactly in the manner stated in the first rule of the robe section² (Niss 1 M).

The commentary on the rule about special robes is finished.

[9. The commentary on the rule about dangerous]

[29. Niss M: *Having kept the rains up to the Kattika full moon, living in such lodgings as wilderness lodgings [which are] considered dangerous, [which are] frightening a bhikkhu may if he wishes deposit one or other of his three robes in a house. And should there be some reason for that bhikkhu to live apart from that robe, he is to live apart from that robe for six nights at the most. If he should live apart from it for longer than that, unless [it is] with the permission of the bhikkhus, there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture.*

(Pāt 44,2-10 = Vin III 263,19-27)] **⟨140⟩**

[81] In the ninth [rule] h-having kept the rains (*upavassam* kho *pana*, Pāt 44,2): here having kept the rains (*upavassam*; *namul* absolute) means having kept the rains (*upavassa*; absolute);³ that is to say, having kept the rains (*upavasitvā*, alternative absolute). For, the final

h-hSp III 730,12-22

¹ That means, when the *kathina* period has been opened by a Saṅgha, the season for robes is extended from one to five months.

² In the Pātimokkha edition and translation this chapter of the Nissaggiya section is given the name *kathina-vagga* (Pāt VI). The reference here clearly shows that at the time of Kkh this section was called *cīvara-vagga*.

³ Both absolute forms, the *namul* absolute (*upa-vassam*) used in the Pātimokkha as well as the historical absolute form *upa-vassa* (Skt *upa-vasya*) seem to have been unusual at the time of the commentator, who explains them by the younger form *upavasitvā*.

274 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture* (140)

nasal [in the *namul* absolute] is to be regarded in the same way as in [the word] *upasampajam* ("having attained"),¹ etc. The meaning is, having entered upon the rains and having lived [there]. And the [syntactical] connection of this word (i.e. *upavassam*) is with the phrase *a bhikkhu living in such lodgings* (*tathārūpesu bhikkhu senāsanesa viharanto*, Pāt 44,4). The [following] is said [by this]: having entered upon the rains and having lived [there], thereafter for the time period ending with the full moon of the later (i.e. second) Kattika² month, *living in such lodgings as wilderness lodgings* [which are] agreed to be dangerous [and] frightening, a bhikkhu may, if he wishes, deposit one or other of his three robes in a house (*yāni kho pana tāni āraññakāni ... pe ... antaraghare nikhippeyya*, Pāt 44,2–6).^{3–h}

There (i.e. in the preceding quotation from Pāt 44,2–6) *wilderness* (*araññakāni*, Pāt 44,3) means: lodgings of the very least distance that have been erected in a place whose distance [at the very least] is at five hundred bow [lengths measured] according to the tensed master bow⁴

¹ Kkh-nṭ 341,2of: *upasampajjan ti ādīsu viyāti* (Kkh 140,2) "pañhamam jhānam upasampajja viharati" *ti* (Vibh 245,7, etc.) imassa Vibhaṅge "upasampajjā" *ti uddharitabbe "upasampajjan" ti uddhaṭam*. "As in [the word] *upasampajjam* ('having attained'), etc., means: Though with respect to this [sentence], 'He dwells having attained the first *jhāna*', the Vibhaṅga should be quoted [with the word] *upasampajja*, it is quoted [with the word] *upasampajjam*." Similar formulations in Sp-t and Vmv. The commentators link the example (*upasampajjam*) given by the author of Kkh with a sentence contained in the Vibhaṅga, and elsewhere. But in all places of the Vinaya we find only *upasampajja viharati*, not *upasampajjam viharati*.

² The later Kattika is the official Kattika, whereas the first Kattika is an alternative designation for the month Assayuja, see Appendix 3.

³ In this explanation of the meaning, the author of Kkh has replaced the first part of the sentence from Pāt (44,2: "Having kept the rains up to the Kattika full moon" (*upavassam kho pana kattikapuṇṇamam*) by a sentence he has obtained through his preceding explanations, and then combined it with a literal quotation of the rest of the sentence from the Pātimokkha rule.

⁴ *ācariya-dhanu*. According to Kkh-nṭ a master bow measures nine spans (*vidatthi**) according to a common cubit (*hattha**), that is, about two metres. Thus 500 master bows would correspond to about one kilometre (about 0.6 miles). If it is measured when the bow string is tensed with an arrow, it measures four cubits, 1.76 metres, which would be about 880 metres (0.55 miles). Kkh-nṭ 342,7ff: *tattha "ācariyadhanu" nāma pakatihatthena navavidatthipamānam, jiyāya pana āropitāya catuhatthapamānan ti vadanti*.

⟨140⟩

Nissaggiyapācittiya 29 M

275

from the [gate] post (*inda-khīla*)¹ of an [enclosed] village. But if the village is unenclosed, [the distance] must be measured from the place suitable for an enclosure [of the village]. If there is an enclosure of a *vihāra*, or, in case a [*vihāra*] is] unenclosed, as far as whatever is the very first lodging of a village² or *cetiya* or Bodhi tree or place where the bhikkhus regularly congregate, so far the [distance] is to be measured by the usual road. It is not suitable to make another road [the measure] or to measure by what is not a road.³

[*Wilderness lodgings*] considered dangerous (*sāsaṅkasammatāni*, Pāt 44,3) means: ⁱ⁻considered to be dangerous⁻ⁱ (resolution of compound) by seeing places, etc., lived in by robbers, etc. ⁱ⁻The meaning is: “thus known”.⁻ⁱ

[*Wilderness lodgings which are*] frightening (*sappaṭibhayāni*, Pāt 44,3) means: [filled] with fear;^{-j} the meaning is: having strong fears put together from seeing the state of men being killed, robbed, and beaten by robbers.

May deposit in a house (*antaraghare nikhippeyya*, Pāt 44,5f.) means: may deposit in a village which is his begging area approved of by himself in the regions in all directions around his wilderness lodging, but that [only] when there is fulfilment of the constituent factors.

^{k-}There, this is the fulfilment of the constituent factors: (i) having entered upon the earlier [rains retreat] he is invited to the great Invitation,⁴ that is the first constituent factor.^{-k} (ii) ^{a-}It is the Kattika

ⁱ⁻ⁱSp III 731,13f. ^{j-j}Sp III 731,15f. ^{k-k}Sp III 731,21ff. ^{a-a}Sp III 731,24f.

“There, the ‘masterbow’ means one measuring nine spans (*vidatthi**) according to the common cubit (*hattha**). But if the bow string is tensed, it measures four cubits, [people] say.”

¹ *inda-khīla*; see above, pp. 95f., n. 4.

² What is meant is the first lodging one arrives at when approaching an unenclosed village.

³ Cf. Sp III 731,1ff.

⁴ As we learn from the new subcommentary, this does not mean that the great Invitation is a factor for this rule, rather the fact that a bhikkhu is invited to participate in the invitation ceremony shows that he did not interrupt his rains [retreat] (Kkh-nṭ 342,21ff.: *mahāpavāraṇāya pavārito hoti* (Kkh 140,22f.) *idam vassacchedam akatvā vuṭṭhabhāvam dassetum vuttam, na pana pavāraṇāya aṅgabhāvam*).

276 *Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture*⟨141⟩

month; that is the second constituent factor.^a (iii) ^bThe lodging is joined to a minimum distance of five hundred bows; that is the third constituent factor. (iv) In [a lodging of] a shorter distance [to the village] or of a distance more than one *gāvuta*¹ (i.e. about 300 or 400 metres), it is not proper [to deposit one or other of his robes in a house]. For [from] where it is possible to come back again to the *vihāra* exactly at the time of having eaten after having begged for food, only that [type of lodging] is intended here (i.e. in the *gāvuta* example).^b ^c[The lodging] is indeed dangerous and frightening; that is the fourth constituent factor.^c ⟨141⟩

Some reason (*kocid eva paccayo*, Pāt 44.6) means: some cause.

From that robe (*tena cīvaraṇa*, Pāt 44.6f.) means: from that robe deposited in a house.

To live apart (*vippavāsāya*, Pāt 44.7) means: to live separate (alternative word).

If he should live apart from it for longer (*tato ce uttari vippavaseyya*, Pāt 44.8) means: more than six nights; the meaning is: [if] in that lodging he should let the sun rise a seventh time. But by him thus being unable [to return before the seventh day],² crossing the village boundary, living in a hall or somewhere or other, knowing what is happening with [his] robe, it is suitable to go away.

Unless [it is] with the permission of the bhikkhus (*aññatratrā bhikkhusammutiyā*, Pāt 44.9) means: whatever permission for living apart from the robe the Sangha gives to a bhikkhu who is ill, except for that. There

^{b–b}Sp III 731,25–29 ^{c–c}Sp III 731,31–32,1

¹ *gāvuta**. Even if the distance from the wilderness lodging to the village should exceed one *gāvuta*, the distance would still be too short for the lodging to be counted as a wilderness lodging since the required distance is at least a little more than two *gāvuta*, that is half a *yojana**.

² Kkh-nṭ 343,20–24: *tathā asakkontenā ti* (Kkh 141.5) *gataṭṭhānassa dūratāyā senāsanam āgantvā sattamam aruṇam uṭṭhāpetum asakkontena. “evam pi asakkontena tatr’ eva thitena paccuddharitabbaṃ atirekacīvaraṭṭhāne thassati ti”* (Sp III 732,10ff.). “**By him thus being unable** means: by him being unable to let the seventh sun rise (that is, the sun on the seventh day) after having come to [his] lodging because of the remoteness of the place he has gone to. By him thus being unable remaining just there [the robe] is to be formally given up [with the thought] that it will remain in the status of an extra robe.”

⟨141⟩*Nissaggiyapācittiya 30 M*

277

is forfeiture for one who lives apart for more than six nights without having received permission.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning many bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter of living apart from robes (= 3. *subject matter*).

The remainder here is to be understood exactly in the manner stated in the second rule of the Robe section (Niss 2 M).¹

The commentary on the rule about dangerous.

[10. The commentary on the rule about apportioned]

[30. Niss M: *If any bhikkhu should knowingly have apportioned to himself an apportioned possession belonging to the Saṅgha, there is an offence entailing expiation with forfeiture.*

(Pāt 44,12f. = Vin III 265,31f.)]

[82] In the tenth [rule] ^d-belonging to the Saṅgha (*saṅghikam*, Pāt 44,12) means: the property of the Saṅgha. For because of being apportioned to the Saṅgha, even if it has not entered the hand, it is the property of the Saṅgha in one way.^{-d}

^e-Possession (*lābhām*, Pāt 44,12) means: some object such as a robe, etc., which is to be received.^{-e}

^f-Apportioned (*parinātam*, Pāt 44,12) means:^{-f} an [object] exists as one aimed at the Saṅgha ^g-by breaking into speech, “We will give. We will make”,^{-g} or by a hand gesture.

Should have apportioned to himself (attano parināmeyya, Pāt 44,13) means: saying such things as “Give this to me”, he should cause it to be aimed at himself. But if it is given to the Saṅgha, it is not suitable to take it; it is to be given to the Saṅgha only. There is [an offence of] wrong doing in the action for one causing [something] to be apportioned to

^{d-d}Sp III 732,25ff. ^{e-e}Sp III 732,29–33,1 ^{f-f}Sp III 733,2 ^{g-g}Sp III 733,4f.

¹ Niss 2 M is classified as a rule inclusive of bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs (*sādhāraṇa*). By referring to Niss 2 M for the classification of Niss 29 M the author of Kkh makes Niss 29 M also a rule inclusive of bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs, despite the fact that it is a rule exclusive to bhikkhus (*asādhāraṇa*) according to Sp IV 919,16–19, where this rule is mentioned as *āraññaka-sikkhāpadam*, and that the *Bhikkhunī-pātimokkhas* which include Niss 2 M, do not include Niss 29 M. Vjb and Kkh-pṭ both indicate that for Niss 29 M the factors constituting an offence are not mentioned. See Kieffer-Pülz 2016b: 68f. and n. 50.

278 Bhikkhupātimokkha F. Rules Entailing Expiation with Forfeiture (142)

himself that is apportioned to co-religionists or householders or even the property of his mother. By [the very act of] receiving [it], it is to be forfeited. (142)

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter of causing to be apportioned (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is [an offence of] wrong doing for one who is in doubt about something which is apportioned, for one who thinks it is apportioned when it is not apportioned, and for one who is in doubt, and for one who causes to be apportioned to another Saṅgha, etc., something which is apportioned to someone or other among Saṅgha, cetiya, or individual (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for someone who, thinking it is not apportioned when asked, “To whom shall we give [it]?", says, “Towards where your heart is inclined, give there";¹ or “[wherever] your donation might receive use”,² and to one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) the state of being apportioned to the Saṅgha, (ii) the causing to be apportioned to oneself knowing this, (iii) the receiving (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] taking what is not given (Pār 2 M).

The commentary on the rule about apportioned is finished.

The section about bowls, the third.

The rules entailing expiation with forfeiture are finished.

¹ This answer comes from the non-offence clause of Niss 30 M (Vin III 266,25f., BD II 162f.). Sp has a different wording, giving, however, the same sense, Sp III 734,13: *yattha icchatha, tattha dethā ti vattabbam*. “It is to be said, ‘Where you wish, give [it] there.’”

² This answer also is given in the non-offence clause of Niss 30 M (Vin III 266,23f., BD II 162f.). In Sp III 734,13ff. it is only stated that if asked “To whom shall we give” it should be responded in the way transmitted in the text, that is, the Vinaya.

⟨142⟩*Nissaggiyapācittiya Conclusion*

279

[Recited, venerable sirs, are the thirty rules entailing expiation with forfeiture.

There I ask the venerable ones, “Are you pure in this?” A second time I ask, “Are you pure in this?” A third time I ask, “Are you pure in this?” The venerable ones are pure in this; therefore they are silent. Thus I record it.¹

(Pāt 44,16–21 = Vin III 266,31–35)]

Thus the commentary on [the rules] entailing expiation with forfeiture of the Kañkhāvitaranī, the commentary on the Pātimokkha, is finished.

¹ This section (Pāt 44,16–21) is not printed in Kkh (142), unlike in the sections of the three preceding offence categories where the respective sections are also printed in Kkh because they are commented on. Nevertheless, we added this section here for coherence.

280

Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation

⟨143⟩

⟨143⟩ [G. The Section of Rules Entailing Expiation]

[These ninety-two rules, venerable sirs, entailing expiation come up for recitation.

(Pāt 46,2f. = Vin IV 1,5f.)]

[a. The section about lying]

[1. The commentary on the rule about lying]

[1. Pāc M: In [uttering] a conscious lie there is [an offence entailing] expiation.

(Pāt 46,6 = Vin IV 2,14)]

In the first [rule]¹ of the section about lying in the [group of offences entailing] expiation, In [uttering] a conscious lie (*sampajānamusāvāde*, Pāt 46,6) means: in speaking a lie, [both] knowing [it] beforehand and knowing [it] just at the time of speaking. And “speaking” (*bhāvanā*) here means the action of making known physically or verbally, [something] untrue being true or [something] true being untrue. And this is the locative case in the sense of the instrumental (*nimittatthe*). Therefore, whoever speaks a conscious lie, for him this is the instrument (*nimitta*), this is the cause (*hetu*); because of that there is [an offence entailing] expiation. In this context and on other such occasions the meaning is to be understood thus.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Hatthaka the Sakyaputta (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “asserting, etc., having previously denied” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

For one telling a lie in order to announce superhuman qualities, it is [an offence entailing] defeat (Pār 4 M). [For one telling a lie] in order to accuse [someone] of an unfounded [offence entailing] defeat, it is [an offence entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha (Sgh 8 M). [For one telling a lie] in order to accuse [someone] of [an offence entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha, it is [an offence entailing] expiation (Pāc 76 M). [For one telling a lie] in order to accuse [someone] of a

¹ Concerning the position of this rule in the sequence of the Pātimokha rules, see von Hinüber 1999: 45.

⟨143⟩

Suddhapācittiya 2 M

281

failure in [right] behaviour, it is [an offence of] wrong doing. [For one telling a lie] in a roundabout way, such as “[The bhikkhu] who lives¹ in your dwelling place [has attained this or that spiritual stage]”,² in order to announce [his own] superhuman qualities, acknowledging³ [it] — when it is a lie⁴ — there is a grave [offence]; not acknowledging [it], it is [an offence of] wrong doing.⁵ For one simply telling a lie there is here [an offence entailing] expiation (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one speaking in haste without reflecting, [83] for one [thinking,] “I shall say one thing”, [and then] saying something else, and for one who is insane, etc.⁶ (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the two constituent factors here: (i) the devotion to deception, (ii) and that individual’s action of making known that matter which he wants to speak about with a deceitful mind (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] taking what is not given (Pār 2 M).

The commentary on the rule about lying is finished.

[2. The commentary on the rule about abusive speech]

[2. Pāc M: *In abusive speech there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 46,8 = Vin IV 6,5)]

¹ Kkh has the reading *vasī* in the main text, and *vasatī* as a reading of C^e in the notes (Kkh 143, n. 6). The passage has been borrowed from Kkh in Sp-t III 3,3-6, where the reading is *vasatī* in the Burmese edition (this portion is not covered by C^e which is incomplete). In the Vinaya this manner of roundabout speech is dealt with in connection with Pār 4 M, where we regularly have *vasī*, that is, the aorist of *vasati*.

² Compare the statement in connection with Pār 4 M (Kkh 55,5ff; above, p. 123).

³ That is, acknowledging that he is telling a lie, being aware that he is lying; see BD VI 50, n. 3.

⁴ There is no offence if he tells the truth (Vin IV 30,20).

⁵ This special type of lie about one’s own alleged superhuman state falls under Pār 4 M. If the bhikkhu does not directly refer to himself by “I”, but refers to himself in a roundabout way as “The bhikkhu who lives in your dwelling place”, then saying and acknowledging it, that counts as a grave offence (*thullaccaya*); saying, but not acknowledging it, counts as an offence of wrong doing, see Vin III 99,1–100,4, *sampajānamusā bhanantassa paṭivijānatassā āpatti thullaccayassa, na paṭivijānatassā āpatti dukkaṭassa*.

⁶ Vin IV 4,22ff. (BD II 162f.).

282 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* 〈144〉

〈144〉 In the second [rule], *In abusive speech* (*omasavāde*, Pāt 46.8) means: in aggressive speech. The meaning is: there is [an offence entailing] expiation in a speech defaming (*akkosana-vacane*) any bhikkhu — one who has committed or not committed [an offence entailing] defeat — with whatever [subject], whether true or untrue, among birth, name, clan, work, craft, disease, characteristics, defilement, attainment,¹ mode of address (*akkosa*)² — by some sort of speech or hand gesture, not pointing [it] out in a roundabout way.³

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “abusing” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

For [a bhikkhu] abusing by exactly these ten subjects of abuse, pointing [it] out in a roundabout way in a manner such as h—“There are some *candālas* here”,⁴ etc., [and] for [a bhikkhu] abusing by words independent of the text (i.e. the Vinaya)ⁱ such as “You are a thief, you are a pickpocket”,ⁱ and for [a bhikkhu] abusing one who is unordained in some way or other, there is [an offence of] wrong doing. Here, even a bhikkhunī counts as one who is unordained.⁴ For [a bhikkhu] not wishing to abuse, speaking only from a desire to joke, it is [an offence of] wrong speech everywhere (= 6. [sorts of] *offence*).

There is no offence for those devoted to meaning and Dhamma and teaching, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

h–h Vin IV 9,33 i–i Sp IV 739,25

¹ *āpatti*; see Vin IV 7,14 (BD II 177).

² *akkosa*, which is defined at Vin IV 7,15–23 (BD II 177f.) as consisting in a low and a high mode of address. While the low mode consists in insulting speech, the high mode consists in praise. Therefore *akkosa* in this list cannot have the same meaning as *akkosana* in *akkosana-vacane* (Kkh 144.6).

³ As can be seen from the factors for this offence given below (p. 283), it is only an offence of wrong doing if one uses abusive speech in the presence of a bhikkhu pointing at someone other than himself.

⁴ This refers to the fact that in Pāc 2 M bhikkhunīs are considered unordained.

⟨145⟩*Suddhapācittiya 3 M*

283

These are the four constituent factors here: (i) the one he insults being ordained, (ii) abusing through [one of the subjects of abuse such as] birth, etc., not pointing [it] out in a roundabout way,¹ (iii) knowing “he is abusing me”, (iv) the absence of devotion to meaning, etc. (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [*sorts of origin*]), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] taking what is not given (Pār 2 M),
but here the feeling is unpleasant (= 17. *feeling*).

The commentary on the rule about abusive speech is finished.

[3. The commentary on the rule about malicious speech]

[3. Pāc M: *In malicious speech of a bhikkhu there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 46,10 = Vin IV 12,23)]

In the third [rule], ^j-*In malicious speech of a bhikkhu: (bhikkhu-pesuññe, Pāt 46,10)* means: in *malicious speech* of a bhikkhu (resolution of compound).^j The meaning is: for that bhikkhu who, having heard² from a bhikkhu abusing [another] bhikkhu through one of the subjects of abuse such as birth, etc.,³ ⟨145⟩ not being angry,⁴ [but] because [in him there] is the presence of longing to be dear to this [other] bhikkhu⁵ or because [there] is a desire [to cause] a rift [between two bhikkhus].⁶

^j-j ≠ Sp IV 740,19f.

¹ Since pointing [it] out in a roundabout way when abusing someone using one of the ten subjects of abuse leads only to an offence of wrong doing, the abuse must be expressed directly.

² Kkh 144,25, and 145,19 read *bhikkhuno sutvā vacanam*; in some manuscripts *sutvā vacanam* is omitted, and in C^e it is inverted (*vacanam sutvā*). In Sp we read *bhikkhuto sutvā*, “having heard from a bhikkhu”, instead. Mūlas-t 479,16f., Sp-t III 5,4, and Vmv II 4,4 tacitly borrowed the second sentence with this expression from Kkh, and in all three texts we simply read *bhikkhuno sutvā*, the word *vacanam* being omitted. Accordingly, the word *vacanam* should probably be deleted in Kkh.

³ There are ten subjects for bringing malicious speech, see Vin IV 12,26ff., BD II 187.

⁴ Kkh reads *akkuddho*, as does Mūlas-t 479,18 which tacitly borrowed the respective sentence from Kkh.

⁵ Thānissaro (2007: I 300) gives several examples for both intentions based on the Vinaya.

⁶ As the *anāpatti* formula shows, there is no offence if the bhikkhu’s motivation

284 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* 〈145〉

there is [an offence entailing] expiation in that malicious utterance brought about physically or verbally.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “bringing about malicious speech” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

For [a bhikkhu] abusing by pointing out in a roundabout way exactly in the stated way, there is [an offence of] wrong doing in bringing about the utterance or in bringing about abuse [by words] independent of the text (i.e. the Vinaya), and in bringing it about [with reference] to someone who is unordained.¹

Here too² a bhikkhunī comes under the category of one who is unordained (= 6. [sorts of] *offence*).

There is no offence for one speaking not because of [his] longing to be dear or not because of [his] desiring [to cause] a rift, but only for blaming evil, and for one who is insane, etc.³ (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) bringing about [malicious] speech to a bhikkhu,⁴ after having heard⁵ of [a] bhikkhu abusing [another one] not pointing [it] out in a roundabout way by [one of the subjects of abuse such as] birth, etc., (ii) there being one or other [84] of longing to be dear or desiring [to cause] a rift, (iii) knowing this (= 9. *constituent factors*).

is not to make himself dear (*piyakamyatā*) to a bhikkhu or is not to cause a rift between two bhikkhus (*bhedādhippāya*), cf. Sp IV 740,21–25.

¹ For these, see the casuistry to Pāc 3 in Vin IV 14,3–10 (BD II 189).

² See above, p. 282.

³ Vin IV 14,11f. (BD II 189).

⁴ Bringing about malicious speech to a bhikkhu may mean that a third bhikkhu informs a bhikkhu about whom a second bhikkhu had made such malicious remarks; but it can also be a bhikkhu not directly concerned. For various examples, see Thānissaro 2007: I 300.

⁵ Kkh 145,10 *sutvā vacanam*; several commentaries (Mūlas-t, Sp-t, Vmv) take up this phrase, but none has *vacanam*. Compare also *upasampannassa sutvā* in Vin IV 13,3,7, etc. (twenty-nine references in Pāc 3 M).

Page 333 job: 1272818

⟨145⟩ *Suddhapācittiya 4 M* 285

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are exactly the same as for [the rule about] taking what is not given (Pār 2 M).

The commentary on the rule about malicious speech is finished.

[4. The commentary on the rule about reciting the Doctrine word by word]

[4. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should make someone who is unordained recite the Doctrine word by word, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 46,12f. = Vin IV 14,30f.)]

In the fourth [rule] *Should make [someone] recite the Doctrine word by word (padaso dhammam vāceyya, Pāt 46,12f.)* means: should make [someone] recite word by word the Doctrine in the Tipiṭaka embodied in the three councils (*saṅgīti*), and even [the Doctrine which is] not embodied in the three councils, e.g. the Rājovādasutta,¹ Tikkhindriya,² Catuparivattana,³ [the taming of] Nandopananda,⁴ Kulumbasutta,⁵ Maggakathā,⁶ etc.⁷ The meaning is: each individual part among the

¹ See Appendix 27.

² Sp IV 742,25 *tikkhindriyam*; nothing further is known about this text.

³ Sp IV 742,25 *catuparivattam*; nothing further is known about this text.

⁴ Sp IV 742,25; Nandopananda was a nāga king tamed by Mahāmoggallāna. Though the Nandopananda-damana was not handed down at the three Councils, it seems to have been accepted by later authors (Skilling 2006: 130 [2009: 177]). Various aspects of the Nandopananda-damana have been examined by Hayashi, who investigates the formation and transmission as an apocryphal story (Hayashi 2014b), identifies the Nandopanandanāgarāja-damana as an interpolation in the Visuddhimagga (Hayashi 2014d), and traces a Tibetan parallel translated into Tibetan among others by the Sri Lankan Ānandaśrī (13th/14th century C.E.). He further compares it with various versions handed down in Chinese translation (Hayashi 2014c). In another contribution he investigates the development of the *nāga* taming as a motif (Hayashi 2015).

⁵ Sp IV 742,24 *Kulumbasuttam*. The Kulumba- or Kulumbasutta is a well-known sutta not contained in the Tipiṭaka but cited in the Atthasālinī (As 90,38–91,5), and in the Itivuttakaṭṭhakathā (It-a II 49,11ff.). See DPPN I s.v. Kulumbasutta; see also Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 663, and n. 7.

⁶ Maggakathā; DPPN s.v. lists this name as the title of the ninth chapter of the Patisambhidāmagga. It obviously must refer to a text different from that.

⁷ Hayashi (2013: 21–46) discusses the apocryphal suttas not listed in the Buddhist Councils. For further texts handed down outside the canon, see von

286 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨146⟩

[first] word, the next word, the next syllable, the next expression.¹

[*Offence entailing*] expiation (*pācittiyam*, Pāt 46,13) means: for [a bhikkhu] speaking any part whatsoever among these words, etc., together with other individuals aside from a bhikkhu or a bhikkhunī, there is [an offence entailing] expiation in accordance with the number of words, etc.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “[making people] recite the Doctrine word by word” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*). ⟨146⟩

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.² It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking he is unordained when he is ordained and for one who is in doubt³ (= 6. *[sorts of] offence*).

There is no offence (1) ^{k-}in undertaking a joint recitation together with one who is unordained,^{4-k} (2) in studying [together with one who is unordained], (3) in undertaking a recitation in the presence of [one who is unordained], (4) for one declaiming and expounding a text that is familiar for the most part, (5) and even for one jointly declaiming [a text] in saying in a place in a text where [the reciter] stumbles, “Speak thus”,⁵ and for those who are insane, etc.⁶ (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) being unordained, (ii) reciting the Doctrine with the stated characteristics word by word,

^{k-k} ≠ Sp IV 743,10f.

Hinüber 1996a: §437. Wynne (2004: 109) takes this rule as an instance showing showing that word-for-word repetition was a basic literary training in early Buddhism.

¹ These terms are defined in Vin IV 15,iff.; furthermore, in Sp IV 741,13ff.; the latter definition is taken over in Kkh-nṭ 349,20ff.

² Vin IV 15,13–16 (BD II 192).

³ Vin IV 15,17f. (BD II 192).

⁴ In other words, reciting together with someone who is not ordained but who already knows the text rather than having them repeat it word for word after the bhikkhu; in other words, a form of rehearsal.

⁵ For this, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 183].

⁶ Vin IV 15,20ff. (BD II 192f.).

⟨146⟩*Suddhapācittiya 5 M*

287

[and (iii) finishing [the recitation] together (= 9. *constituent factors*).]

^aThe [offence against this rule has the] origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., of [the rule about] the Doctrine word by word (Pāc 4 M); [it originates in] activity (= 11. *activity*), [has] no acquittal due to [lacking] awareness (= 12. *awareness*), [is] not [dependent on] intention (= 13. *intention*), [is a fault according to a precept [laid down by the Buddha] (= 14. *fault*), [is] a verbal deed (= 15. *deed*), [is done with] three [types of] thought (= 16. *thoughts*), [with] three [types of] feeling (= 17. *feelings*).^{-a}

The commentary on the rule about [reciting]
the Doctrine word by word is finished.

[5. The commentary on the first rule about lying down together]

[5. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should make a joint sleeping place for more than two or three nights together with one who is unordained, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 46,15f. = Vin IV 16,31f.)]

In the fifth [rule], with one unordained (*anupasampannena*, Pāt 46,15) means: setting aside a bhikkhu, even [making a joint sleeping place together] with an animal which is the object of [an offence entailing] defeat.¹

For more than two or three nights (*uttaridirattirattam*, Pāt 46,15) means: more than two or three nights (resolution of compound).

A joint sleeping place (*sahaseyyam*, Pāt 46,16) means: lying down together in a lodging place which is fully covered and fully enclosed or for the most part covered and for the most part enclosed,² either one after the other or simultaneously.

¹a-a ≠ Sp IV 744,9-12

¹ For details, see Appendix 28.

² Kkh-nt 351,16f. explicitly says that *sabba-cchanna-paricchanne* is an *ekasesa-dvandva* compound. This statement takes up the definition of *sahaseyya* in the old Word Analysis (Vin IV 17,1f.). “Fully” or “for the most part covered” refers to the covering of the roof, whereas “fully” or “for the most part enclosed” refers to an enclosure of a certain height. For details, see Sp IV 745,15-33.

288 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨147⟩

Should make (kappeyya, Pāt 46,16) means: should arrange, should effect.

There, even a [place] enclosed by a wall, etc., one-and-a-half cubits (*hattha*) high (i.e. about 65 cm) that does not touch the covering (i.e. the roof), is to be understood as fully enclosed. Therefore, ^b-[a place] equipped with this characteristic — even if it is a seven-storey palace with one precinct, or a square [building] with four halls [around a yard] (*catu-sālā*)¹ [and] with a hundred rooms^{2-b} — whoever has lain down there or elsewhere in such [a place] with this or that unordained [person] for three nights, [and] on the fourth day when the sun has set, when the unordained [person] has lain down — whether closing the door of the room or not — [the bhikkhu] lies down, or [in case the bhikkhu] has lain down first [and] does not rise up when [the unordained person] is lying down there, ⟨147⟩ [then,] for the [bhikkhu] there is [an offence entailing] expiation in accordance with the number of acts of lying down of both of them [after] having stood up, and [in accordance with] the number of unordained [persons]. This is a summary here. But a detailed [regulation] is stated in all aspects in the Samantapāsādikā.³ [85]

[This rule] was prescribed at Ālavī (= 1. *provenance*) concerning many bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “joint sleeping place with one who is unordained” (= 3. *subject matter*).

This, [i.e.] “for more than two or three nights” (*uttaridirattatirattam*, Pāt 46,15) is the supplementary prescription (*anupaññatti*) here. [The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.⁴ It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking that he is unordained when he is ordained,

^{b-b} ≠ Sp IV 746,if.

¹ *catu-sālā*, a *vihāra* with four halls surrounding a square courtyard. See Bandaranayake 1974, 28; Geiger 1986: §50.

² This sentence is tacitly borrowed from Sp. As Kkh 146, n. 16, indicates, ms Po proceeds with *ekaseyyā icc eva saṅkhayaṁ* (sic) *gacchati*, “is called a joint sleeping place”, which exactly corresponds to the text of Sp.

³ This refers to the very detailed description in Sp IV 745.9-50.3.

⁴ Vin IV 17.8-11 (BD II 197).

⟨147⟩

Suddhapācittiya 6 M

289

or who is in doubt, and in places which are half covered and half enclosed, etc.¹ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one dwelling for less than two or three nights, for one dwelling [there] again after going out before dawn on the third day, for one dwelling in places that are fully covered [but] not fully enclosed, etc., for one lying down while the other is sitting, or sitting down while the other is lying, and for one who is insane, etc.² (= 7. non-offence).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) a lodging which is the subject of [an offence entailing] expiation, (ii) lying down there with one who is unordained, (iii) the setting of the sun on the fourth day (= 9. constituent factors).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are exactly the same as for [the rule about] sheep's wool (Niss 16 M).

The commentary on the first rule about lying down together is finished.

[6. The commentary on the second rule about lying down together]

[6. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should make a joint sleeping place together with a woman, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 46,18f. = Vin IV 19,31f.)]

In the sixth [rule] *with a woman* (*mātugāmēna*, Pāt 46,18) means: with a human female, even one born that day. But demonesses (*yakkhi*) and spirits (*peti*), in visible form, a eunuch,³ and female animals which are the subject of sexual intercourse are here subject to [offences of] wrong doing.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. provenance) concerning the venerable elder Anuruddha (= 2. individual), with respect to the subject matter "joint sleeping place with a woman" (= 3. subject matter).

The remainder is to be understood in exactly the [same] manner stated in the previous rule, except for the limit of nights. For there, the offence was on the fourth day, but here, it is on the very first day.

The commentary on the second rule about lying down together is finished.

¹ Vin IV 17,10–14 (BD II 197).

² Vin IV 17,16–22 (BD II 197).

³ *pandaka*, see above, p. 73, n. 1.

290 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨148⟩

⟨148⟩ [7. The commentary on the rule about teaching the Doctrine]

[7. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should teach the Doctrine to a woman in more than five or six sentences unless a knowledgeable man [is present], there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 46,21 = Vin IV 22,17)]

In the seventh [rule] *in more than five or six sentences* (*uttaricchappañcavācāhi*, Pāt 46,21) means: in this context ^c—the measure of a sentence is to be understood everywhere thus: a quarter of a stanza, one sentence.—^c

Should teach the Doctrine (*dhammam deseyya*, Pāt 46,22) means: should speak the Doctrine having the characteristics stated in the rule about [reciting] the Doctrine word by word¹ or the Doctrine of the commentaries.

Unless a knowledgeable man [is present] (*aññatra viññunā puraviggahena*, Pāt 46,22) means: unless ^d—a knowledgeable man [is present].—^d It is not suitable to teach the Doctrine even to [a woman] standing ^d—together with a male demon (*yakkha*) or spirit (*peta*) or animal² that is standing there having taken human shape.—^d

[*An offence entailing*] expiation (*pācittiyam*, Pāt 46,23) means: there is [an offence entailing] expiation in accordance with the number of words, etc., for one teaching the Doctrine by virtue of words, etc., of more than six sentences to a knowledgeable human female without a man having the characteristics stated in the second undetermined rule (Aniy 2) [being present]. And for one teaching many [women], there is [an offence entailing] expiation in accordance with the number of women.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Elder Udāyi (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “teaching the Doctrine to women” (= 3. *subject matter*).

^c—^cSp IV 751,2f. ^d—^d≠ Sp IV 750,29f.

¹ Pāc 4 M, see above, pp. 285ff.

² The text of Khk 148,10 reads *manussaviggahaṇi gahetvā thitena pana yakkhenā* The *pana* does not make sense in this sentence. But it is confirmed by Khk-nṭ 353,14. The parallel in Sp IV 750,29f. reads *purisaviggahaṇi gahetvāpi thitena na yakkhenā* ... “not with a demon that is standing there, even if he has taken the shape of a man”.

⟨148⟩

Suddhapācittiya 7 M

291

This, [i.e.] “unless a knowledgeable man is present” (*aññatratraviññunā*, Pāt 46,22), is the supplementary prescription (*anupaññatti*) here.

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking it is a woman when it is not a woman, or for one who is in doubt, and for one teaching demonesses (*yakkhi*), female spirits (*peta*), eunuchs, or female animals in human shape² (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one teaching with six sentences or less than that; or, there being a man [present] with the stated characteristics; for one teaching [a woman], either himself having stood up, [and] having sat down again;³ or the woman having stood up [and] being seated again; or teaching another woman;⁴ [there is no offence] — for one teaching even the entire Dīgha-nikāya, being thus asked “What is the purpose of the Dīgha-nikāya, [86] sir?” — [There is no offence] if a woman listens while [the Doctrine] is being said for the sake of another, and for one who is insane,⁵ (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the five constituent factors here: (i) the teaching of more than six sentences of the Doctrine with the stated characteristics, (ii) a woman with the stated characteristics, (iii) the absence of a change of the bodily posture,⁶ (iv) the absence of a legalizer,⁷ (v) not answering a

e—e ≠ Sp IV 751,18ff.

¹ Vin IV 22,32–36 (BD II 206f.).

² Vin IV 22,36–23,4 (BD II 207). Here, assuming human shape is only linked to the animal; in the earlier instance it was connected with the *yakkha* and *peta* too. This clearly reflects the Vinaya text.

³ Obviously, getting up is a sign that the teaching is finished. If he sits down again, and then teaches again, this is counted as a new teaching, and the sentences are counted anew. Compare Vin IV 23,7f.: *utthahitvā puna nisiditvā deseti*.

⁴ That is, another woman than the one he taught before, one that has come when he was seated already (Vin IV 23,9; Sp IV 751,10ff.).

⁵ This corresponds completely to the non-offence clause, Vin IV 23,6–11 (BD II 207).

⁶ That is to say, changing the types of movement (going, standing, sitting, lying). As seen from the non-offence clause, standing up and sitting down again interrupts the teaching.

⁷ *kappiya-kāraka*. This term does not appear in the Vinaya in connection with this rule. It is to be assumed that the learned human male (*viññū purisaviggaha*)

292 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨149⟩

question¹ (= 9. constituent factors).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., ⟨149⟩ are exactly the same as for [the rule about] the Doctrine word by word (Pāc 4 M), only here [the offence originates in] activity and inactivity (= 11. activity).

The commentary on the rule about teaching the Doctrine is finished.

[8. The commentary on the rule about announcing what is true]

[8. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should announce [his own] superhuman state to one who is unordained, if it is true, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 48,2f. = Vin IV 25,22f.)]

In the eighth [rule],² *superhuman state* (*uttarimanussadhammam*, Pāt 48,2f.) means: f—the state of superhumans, of those who attain absorption states, and of noble ones, f having the characteristic stated in the fourth [rule entailing] defeat (Pār 4).

If it is true, there is [an offence entailing] expiation (*bhūtasimī pācittiyam*, Pāt 48,3) means: there being the state of absorption, etc., in him, there is [an offence entailing] expiation for one announcing it to another, except for a bhikkhu and a bhikkhunī.

[This rule] was prescribed at Vesāli (= 1. provenance) concerning the bhikkhus living on the bank of the Vaggumudā river (= 2. individuals) with respect to the subject matter “announcing what is true to them” (= 3. subject matter).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. prescription).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. command).

f-f Sp II 489,1f.

in whose presence the teaching is allowed is designated here as *kappiya-kāraka*.

¹ Answering a question is one of the situations mentioned in the non-offence clause (Vin IV 23,10), and as the example of the Dīgha-nikāya given above shows, when asked, even whole text corpora may be recited.

² This rule belongs to those providing a link between the old locative rules, and the *yo pana bhikkhu* rules, see von Hinüber 1999: 53. For its relation to a regulation in the Cullavagga (Vin II 112,12ff.), see von Hinüber 1999: 65.

There is [an offence entailing] expiation for one announcing directly¹ a state of absorption, etc., existing in himself, if the one to whom he announces it straight away understands the meaning in whatever manner [such as], “This one has obtained absorption”, or “[He is] a noble one.” If he does not understand it, it is [an offence of] wrong doing. But [when] it is announced in a roundabout way (i.e. indirectly), whether he understands or not, it is only [an offence of] wrong doing. (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one announcing [such a state to] an ordained [person], there being a cause of such a nature [to evoke such a statement],² and for the first wrongdoer. But since there is no state of being insane, etc., for the noble ones, but the absorption states diminish for one who has attained the absorption states if this [insanity] exists,³ therefore, they (i.e. the insane) are not included here⁴ (= 7. non-offence).

These are the four constituent factors here: (i) the truth of the super-human state, (ii) announcing [it] to one who is unordained, (iii) the understanding at that moment, (iv) not pointing [it] out in a roundabout way⁵ (= 9. constituent factors).

¹ *nippariyāyena*, “without explanations”; in other cases *anaññāpadesena* is used in such cases (Kkh 144.6, 17f. [Pāc 2 M], 145,10f. [Pāc 3 M]. In the present rule the term *anaññāpadeso* appears in the enumeration of the constituent factors (Kkh 149,20). For a detailed discussion of *paryāya* and *nippariyāya* in Sutta and Abhidhamma, see Gethin 2001: 133ff. See also the explanation of the commentary, which characterizes this as straightforward (*ujukam eva*; Kkh-nṭ 354,2).

² The Vinaya has the following reading: Vin IV 39,20 *upasampannassa bhūtam āroceti*, “if he speaks of what is a fact to one who is ordained” (BD II 218). Deviating from this, Kkh adds that there must be a reason on the part of the bhikkhu who announces his state of spiritual development. This again implies that it would be an offence if he announced his state without any external reason justifying it.

³ This statement goes back at least to the Mahāpaccarī as the statement in Sp IV 752,31f. shows.

⁴ *ummattaka* is a factor given in each non-offence clause except the present one. This is why the commentator considers it necessary to explain its absence here. Cf. Sp IV 752,28ff.

⁵ If a bhikkhu refers to himself in a roundabout way by saying for instance “the one who lives in your monastery” (*yo te vihāre vasati*, Kkh-nṭ 219,26), that is, if he does not speak straightforwardly (*nippariyāyena*), but in a roundabout manner (*paryāyena*) there is only an offence of wrong doing. Thus, for an offence entailing expiation to come about, pointing out directly or not in a

294 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨150⟩

The [offence against this rule has the] origin of [the rule about] announcing what is true¹ (= 10. [sorts of] origin),
 g— it [originates in] activity (= 11. activity),
 [has] no acquittal due to [lacking] awareness (= 12. awareness),
 [is] not [dependent on] intention (= 13. intention),
 [is] a fault according to a precept [laid down by the Buddha] (= 14. fault),
 [is] a physical deed, a verbal deed (= 15. deeds),
 [it is done with] two [types of] thought by wholesome and neutral [types of] thought (= 16. thoughts),
 [it is done with] two [types of] feeling by pleasant and indifferent feelings (= 17. feelings).^g

The commentary on the rule about announcing what is true is finished.

[9. The commentary on the rule about announcing a gross offence]

[9. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should announce a bhikkhu's gross offence to one who is unordained, unless [it is] with the bhikkhus' permission, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 48,5 = Vin IV 31,12f.)] ⟨150⟩

In the ninth [rule] a bhikkhu's (bhikkhussa, Pāt 48,5) means: one who has not committed [an offence entailing] defeat.

Gross offence (*dutthullam*, Pāt 48,5) means: although this is a designation for two classes of offences,² nevertheless, here, only an [offence entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha is intended.³

Unless [it is] with the bhikkhus' permission (*aññatra bhikkhu-sammutiyā*, Pāt 48,6) means: whatever agreement the Saṅgha makes for

^{g—g}Sp IV 753,1ff.

roundabout way is required. In Sp all these details are dealt with in connection with Pār 4 M.

¹ *bhūtarocana-samuṭṭhāna*. This is the first rule with this type of origin. Thus it is named after this rule; see von Hinüber 1992a: 61 [2009: 150].

² This phrase is generally used for Pārājika and Saṅghādisesa offences.

³ As the parallel Sp IV 753,5–8 shows, this statement was already transmitted in the old *atthakathās*. The reason for the restriction to the Saṅghādisesa offences is probably that a bhikkhu who commits an offence entailing defeat (*pārājika*) is *eo ipso* no longer a bhikkhu.

⟨150⟩*Suddhapācittiya 9 M*

295

the restraint in future of a bhikkhu who is constantly offending, having consulted [the Saṅgha] three times,¹ whether making or not making a limit regarding offences and families² — except for that³ — [there is an offence entailing] expiation for one announcing according to an inadequate agreement⁴ [a gross offence] in linking together the offence with the subject matter in a manner such as ^{h-}“This [bhikkhu] having released semen has committed [an offence entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha.”^{5-h}

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “announcing a gross offence” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.⁶ [87] It is [an offence

^{h-h} ≠ Sp IV 754,22ff.

¹ According to Sp IV 754,6–10, the permission of the bhikkhus (*bhikkhu-sammuti*) is to be obtained by looking for approval (*apaloketvā*) three times. Kkh = Mūlas-ṭ 480,16–20 explicitly equate *bhikkhu-sammuti* with *katikā*.

² This takes up the description of a *bhikkhu-sammuti* in the Word Analysis to Pāc 9 M (Vin IV 31,23–32,6).

³ *a-yathā-katikāya*; this reading of Kkh is confirmed by the Kañkhāvitaranī-pitapota (middle of the thirteenth century C.E.; Kkh-pipo 63,17); Nāṇākitti’s Pātimokkhaganthidīpanī (1492/93 C.E.), which largely takes over the text from Kkh, instead of *a-yathā-katikāya* reads *aññatra aññathā kathikāya*, Pāt-gd 45,10–13: *aññatra aññathā kathikāya* (sic) “ayam asuciṃ vametvā saṅghādisesam āpanno” ty ādinā nayena vatthunā saddhiṃ āpattiṃ ghatetvā ārocen-tassa bhikkhuno pācittiyan hoti.

⁴ If there was an agreement according to which the subject matter of the offence and the category of offence are linked, then this agreement would be considered an inadequate agreement (*a-yathā-katikā*). As is obvious from the non-offence clause of Pāc 9 M, there is no offence when either the subject matter or the offence are named. This implicitly makes invalid each agreement in which both are mentioned.

⁵ It is to be assumed that the author of Kkh inserts this as an example for an invalid bhikkhus’ agreement, that is, one which does not protect a bhikkhu who announces the offence according to this agreement from a transgression of Pāc 9 M.

⁶ Vin IV 32,7–11 (BD II 221).

296 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* 〈150〉

of] wrong doing for one thinking it is a gross offence when it is not a gross offence and for one who is in doubt. It is only [an offence of] wrong doing even for one announcing some gross offence called the transgression of the first five rules of training¹ or some other misconduct [that is] not a gross offence² — in the remaining six classes of offence³ — to one who is unordained⁴ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one announcing the mere subject matter⁵ or the mere offence, for one announcing without transgressing the limit [determined by] the bhikkhus' permission, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) [an offence entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha together with its subject matter of a bhikkhu with the stated characteristics, (ii) announcing [it] to one who is unordained, (iii) the absence of the permission of the bhikkhus (= 9. constituent factors).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] taking what is not given (Pāc 2 M),

but here [the offence is done with an] unpleasant [type of] feeling (= 17. feeling).

The commentary on the rule about announcing
a gross offence is finished.

¹ These are the first five rules for novices. These five rules are considered equivalent, equivalent to Pārājika rules, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II 155, n. 80. The reason why only offences of wrong doing arise when one announces Pārājika offences vis-à-vis an unordained person is that the term *dūthullā āpatti*, generally comprising Pārājika as well as Saṅghādisesa offences, is understood here as referring to Saṅghādisesa offences only. Thus, the announcement of a Pārājika offence or an offence conformable to a Pārājika offence does not fall under Pāc 9 M. See Sp IV 753,12–17.

² That is, misconduct not falling under Pārājika or Saṅghādisesa offences, or, if we refer to the novice rules, transgression of the novice rules six to ten, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II 1268, n. 6.

³ All except the Saṅghādisesa section.

⁴ Vin IV 32,11–16 (BD II 221f.).

⁵ IBH rendered *vatthu* in this context with “example” (BD II 222). But it is clear from the usage of *vatthu* in the commentaries that it refers to the subject of a rule, that is, to the bhikkhu to which the rule applies.

⟨151⟩*Suddhapācittiya 10 M*

297

[10. The commentary on the rule about digging the earth]

[10. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should dig the earth or have it dug, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 48,9f. = Vin IV 33,4f.)]

In the tenth [rule] *earth* (*pathavim*, Pāt 48,9) means: two sorts of earth: (1) natural earth and (2) artificial earth.

There, (1) natural earth is of three sorts: (i) pure (i.e. unmixed), (ii) mixed, and (iii) heaped.

There, (i) pure ⟨151⟩ earth means: pure soil or pure clay by nature. (ii) Mixed earth means: where, apart from the soil or the clay, there is a third part of one or other of stone, gravel, pebbles, grit,¹ or sand. (iii) Heaped up earth means: a heap of soil or a heap of clay rained on for more than four months, [thus] it has been said.² But a mixed heap with the stated characteristics and fine dust (*raja*) on a flat piece of stone once drenched with rain³ when it has been raining, is indeed called heaped up earth [if it is] an area drenched with rain at the end of four months.

¹ *marumba*; explained as *katasakkharā* (Sp IV 755,3; Kkh-nt 355,22 = Vin-vn-t I 394,23), “a kind of gravel” (DOP s.v.). *Marumba* is rendered by murum-sand, and as an explanation of murum we find: “[M]urum is a metamorphic rock. It is a form of decomposed laterite and is deep brown or red in colour” (Gopi 2010: II).

² *ti vuttam* generally indicates a quotation (Kieffer-Püllz 2015a: 2.2). In the parallel in Mūlas-ṭ the text reads *hoti* for *ti vuttam*. Since the parallel in Mūlas-ṭ (480,25–81,5) begins earlier (with *tattha*, Kkh 150,26) and runs to the end of the paragraph (Kkh 151,7), the *ti vuttam* in the middle of the text tacitly borrowed from Kkh must have been deliberately changed. In Kkh the *ti vuttam* most probably indicates the non-literal quotation of the definition of *puñja-pathavī* from the Word Analysis of Pāc 10 M in the Vinaya. This only deviates in the sequence of the words, Vin IV 33,11f.: *yo pi pañsupuñjo vā mattikāpuñjo vā atirekacātumāsañ ovañño ayam pi vuccati jātā pathavī*. “Whatever heap of soil or heap of clay is rained on for more than four months, this too is called natural ground.” Kkh-nt 355,27–56,1 states: **vuttan ti** (Kkh 151,4f.) *padabhājaniyam, sīhalatthakathāyam eva vā vuttam*. “It has been said means: either it has been said in the Word Analysis [of Pāc 10 M] or in the Sīhalatthakathā (Sinhalese commentary).”

³ In Mūlas-ṭ *sakim ce tintam*, “if once drenched with rain” for Kkh *sakim tintam*.

298 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨151⟩

These three sorts of earth which are not burnt by virtue of baking bowls in an oven, etc.,¹ or in any sort of way, are called natural earth. But [earth] burnt or mixed together with stone, etc., to a greater extent than the stated measure, is called artificial earth; so what should be said of [that] consisting of pure stone, etc.² There, what is called natural earth is unlawful earth. Whatever bhikkhu himself digs earth of such a sort [or] spoils it by digging, breaking,³ scraping, or burning, etc., for him there is [an offence entailing] expiation in accordance with the number of actions.

But whoever causes it to be dug, [or] causes it to be spoiled in the exact manner stated, for him thus having specified “this area” or “this earth”, ordering in a manner such as “dig, break”, there is [an offence of] wrong doing because of the order. If he, being ordered once, digs even for a [whole] day, there is only a single [offence entailing] expiation [for the one giving the order].⁴ If the other [bhikkhu]⁵ gives orders again and again, ⁱ—there is [an offence entailing] expiation for each utterance.^{—i}

[This rule] was prescribed at Ālavi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the bhikkhus of Ālavi (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “digging the earth” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is [an offence of] wrong doing for one who is in doubt about

ⁱ⁻ⁱSp IV 755,18f.

¹ As the more detailed description in Sp IV 755,6 shows, *ādi* refers to *kumbha-kārāvāpādi*, etc.

² “Etc.” stands for *sakkhara*, *kathala*, *marumba*, and *vāluka*, mentioned above as material that might be mixed with soil or clay (Kkh 151,2f), see Kkh-nt 356,5f.

³ *bhedana*; according to Kkh-nt 356,9f. *bhindati* here consists in throwing out water on the earth (*udakam chaḍḍento bhindati*).

⁴ In Kkh 151,18 “[āñāpakassa]” within square brackets has been put in the main text. In n. 8 it is stated that this word is added in B^e, and S^e “on the strength of the parallel passage at Sp IV 755,15–19”. Sp IV 755,16f. reads: *sace pi sakaladi-vasam khaṇati āñāpakassa ekañ ñeva pācittiyam*, “Even if he digs the entire day it is only an offence of expiation for the one giving the order.”

⁵ *itaro*; defined as being the one who gives the order (*āñāpako*, Kkh-nt 356,21f.).

⟨152⟩*Suddhapācittiya 10 M*

299

the earth [when it is earth],¹ for one thinking it is earth when it is not earth, and for one who is in doubt [when it is not earth]² (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence (1) for one who says, ^j“Dig a lotus pond”,^j [or] ^k“Dig a hole”,^k [or] ^a“Dig a radish”,^a etc., without specifying a place;³ (2) for one who spoils each [type of] artificial earth (2.1) such as broken clay, having been dried by the heat; or (2.2) [earth that is] bumpy (?) because of [trampling] cattle, ^bunconnected with the earth underneath;^b or (2.3) a river bank fallen down after having been broken off; [or] (2.4) even a large lump of clay broken by the plough; and (3) for one who says, “Know the hole for this pillar”, [88] [or] “Give clay”, [or] “Bring clay”, [or] “I need soil”, [or] “Make the clay **⟨152⟩** lawful”;⁴ (4) for one breaking [earth] unintentionally by removing trees, etc.;⁵ (5) for one scratching [the earth] inadvertently with his big toe, etc.;⁶ or (6) for one not knowing that it is natural earth or that he will dig it,⁷ and (7) for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) natural earth, (ii) thinking that it is earth, (iii) one or other of digging or causing to dig (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] taking what is not given (Pār 2 M),

^j-jSp IV 755,20 ^k-kSp IV 755,22 ^a-aSp IV 755,24 ^b-b≠ Sp IV 755,29f.

¹ IBH erroneously states that an offence entailing expiation arises in that case, “If he is in doubt as to whether it is ground [and] digs it ..., there is an offence of expiation.” (BD II 224).

² Vin IV 33,24f. (BD II 224).

³ These cases are not covered by the *anāpatti* regulation of the Vinaya. In Sp IV 755,19ff. they are listed with the remark that they are decisions without recourse to the text, that is, independent of the Vinaya (*pāli-muttaka-vinicchaya*); they are not listed in the commentary on the *anāpatti* section, however. Here Kkh shows a younger stage of development, where the cases are included in the *anāpatti* section.

⁴ More detailed, but covering the same cases, Sp IV 758,33–59,3.

⁵ Sp IV 759,3–7.

⁶ Sp IV 759,8–11.

⁷ Sp IV 759,11–15.

300 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨152⟩

but [the offence against this rule is] a fault according to a precept [laid down by the Buddha] (= 14. *fault*),

[is done with] three [types of] thought (= 16. *thoughts*),
 [with] three [types of] feeling (= 17. *feelings*).

The commentary on the rule about digging the earth is finished.

The section about lying, the first.

[b. The section about the plant category]

[i. The commentary on the rule about the plant category]

[ii. Pāc M: *In causing damage to the plant category there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 48,14 = Vin IV 34,34)]

In the first [rule]¹ of the section about the plant category, ^{c-}*in causing damage to the plant category* (*bhūtagāmapātabyatāya*, Pāt 48,14): here, “plants” (*bhūtā*) means they are (*bhavanti*) and they were (*ahesum*); the meaning is: they are born (*jāyanti*), they increase (*vaḍḍhanti*), and [thus] they are being born (*jātā*) and increased (*vaḍḍhitā*). “Category”² (*gāmo*) means: group (*rāsi*); “*bhūta-gāmo*” means: the category of plants (*tappurisa compound*) or the plants indeed are a category (*kamma-dhāraya compound*).

This is a designation for green grass, green trees, etc., which are rooted [in the ground]. “Causing damage” (*pātabyatā*) is the state of damaging; the meaning is: the state of being usable³ according to [one’s] liking by cutting, breaking, etc., in that *causing damage to the plant category* (*bhūta-gāma-pātabyatāya*); and this is the locative case in the sense of the instrumental of cause. The meaning is: there is [an offence entailing] expiation by reason of causing damage to the plant category, by means of cutting, etc., the plant category.^{-c}

^{c-c} ≠ Sp IV 761,7–15

¹ For the position of this rule in the sequence of the Pātimokha, see von Hinüber 1999: 45.

² *gāma* (Skt *grāma*); at the end of compounds, *grāma/gāma* means a multitude, a class, a collection or number in general (MW s.v.); “a class, a collection” (DOP s.v. *gāma*², 2).

³ This is an attempt to express the future passive participle.

⟨153⟩

Suddhapācittiya II M

301

Therefore, whatever bhikkhu spoils [a plant] germinated here or there in the earth, water, or on walls, etc., not dried up, even a very tiny piece of grass, even a mustard seed (*sāsapa-bijaka*) or a *sevāla* plant,¹ by means of pulling up, cutting, piercing, etc., or causes to be spoiled in the manner stated [in the rule about] digging the earth (Pāc 10 M), commits [an offence entailing] expiation.

[This rule] was prescribed at Ālavi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the bhikkhus at Ālavi (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “cutting trees” (= 3. *subject matter*). ⟨153⟩

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is [an offence of] wrong doing for anyone damaging one or other [item] — separated from the plant category — among root seeds, stem seeds, joint seeds, cutting seeds, [and] germ seeds, whether they are in a receptacle or made into a heap, or whether the mere root comes out, or the mere shoot comes out, even though they are planted in the earth; even if the edge of a leaf a span (*vidatthi**, i.e. 22 cm) in size is coming out of it, whether the root is coming out or not coming out, for so long as there is not a green shoot [it is an offence of wrong doing]. Similarly, for one who is in doubt about the plant category and the seed category, and for one who thinks it is in the plant category or the seed category when it is not in the plant category or the seed category, and for one who is in doubt [it is an offence of wrong doing]² (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

But there is no offence for one who is not thinking like this regarding both [categories],³ and for one who is insane, etc. There is no offence for one who damages, unintentionally, through lack of attention, or not knowing; for one saying, “Cut a tree”, [or] “Cut a creeper”, etc., without

¹ *sevāla* seems to be an overarching category for a number of other plants, among them mustard seeds (*sāsapa-bijaka*) and sesamum seeds (*tila-bijaka*) growing in water (Sp IV 763,1f.), see further Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 190].

² Vin IV 35,15f., 17ff. (BD II 229).

³ That is with respect to the plant category and the seed category (*bhūta-gāma-bija-gāma*), Kkh-nt 358,23f.

302 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* 〈153〉

specifying “this tree”; and for one saying, “Know this flower or this fruit”, [or] ^d“Give this”, [or] “Bring that”, [or] “I need this”, [or] “Make this lawful”^d (= 7. non-offence).

But this type of seed (*bīja-jātam*)¹ separated from the plant category (*bhūta-gāma*) by lawful speech,² may be eaten only after again having had made [it lawful, with the words,] “Make it lawful.”³ For in this way even its release from the seed category is made.

But he who makes [it] lawful, has to make [it lawful] by means of (i) fire or (ii) nail or (iii) knife. (i) ^e—And he who makes [it lawful] by means of fire, has to make [it lawful] by touching [it] in one place with any sort of fire, [89] having indeed said, “[It is] lawful.”⁴ (ii) He who makes [it lawful] by means of a knife, has to make [it lawful] in exactly the same way:⁵ by making visible a piercing or cutting by means of the point or the blade of some sharp knife or even of a needle, a nail, or

^{d-d}Vin IV 35,20f. ^{e-e}≠ Sp IV 767,11–18

¹ *bīja-jāta* is one of the five types of seeds subsumed under *bhūta-gāma*, as is evident from the Word Analysis in the Vinaya (Vin IV 34,35–35,13).

² This refers back to the words mentioned in the preceding sentence with which a *bhūta-gāma* may be made lawful (*kappiya*). As we learn from Sp IV 767,1ff. a *bhūta-gāma* can be made lawful by this method and can therefore be used to make medicine; see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 194].

³ By the first “lawful making act” the *bīja-jāta* is released from the *bhūta-gāma*, and can be used for medicines; but if someone wants to eat it, it has to be made lawful a second time with one of the sentences listed in the non-offence clause in the Vinaya (Vin IV 35,20ff.) in order to release the respective part of the plant from the *bīja-gāma* status as well; see Sp IV 767,1ff.: *ettāvatā bhūta-gāmaparimocanam katam hoti, paribhuñjantena pana bījagāmaparimocanattham puna kappiyam kāretabbam*. “By so little, [parts of plants] are released from the plant category [status]; but one eating it has to make it lawful again in order to release it from the seed category [status].” Cf. Khuddas-nt 323,11–14: *tasmā imam puppham phalam vā jāna, imam kappiyam karohī*” *ti ādinā kappiyavacanena bhūtagāmato viyojitaṁ bījajātam bījagāmaparimocanattham puna kappiyam kārāpetvā paribhuñjitabbam*.” “Therefore, the seed category being released from the plant category by lawful speech such as ‘Know this flower or this fruit’, [or] ‘Make this lawful’, may be eaten after again having had [someone] make it lawful, in order to release it from the seed category.”

⁴ See the somewhat more detailed passage in Sp IV 767,11–14, translated in Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II 1284, n. 8.

⁵ That is, only after having said, “[It is] lawful”, Kkh-nt 359,10.

⟨154⟩

Suddhapācittiya II M

303

|some cutting tool¹ (*chedana*), etc. (iii) He who makes [it lawful] by
|means of a nail,^{-e} has to make [it lawful] in the exact manner stated in
|respect of a knife: by means of some non-putrid nail or other of men or
|animals — even by means of one brought, having cut it — except for
|the hooves of cows or buffaloes, etc.²

f—There, even if there is a heap of seeds the size of a mountain or a
|thousand trees [all] tied together after cutting them down, or a great load
|of sugar cane placed there after tying it up, when one single seed or
|branch of a tree or sugar cane has been made lawful, all is made [lawful].
|If] one pierces a piece of wood tied together with the [sugar canes, with
|the words,] “I make [this] sugar cane lawful”, it is indeed suitable. But
|if someone pierces whatever creeper the load is tied up with, it is not
|suitable.^{3-f} ⟨154⟩

g—[If] they bring a meal (*bhatta*) mixed with ripe peppers, etc., [and]
|when it is said, “Make [it] lawful”, it is indeed suitable, even if one
|pierces lumps of boiled rice. Exactly the same method [applies] to
|sesame seeds and grains of rice, too. But [if grains of rice] thrown into
|the rice gruel⁴ that are [initially] stuck together in one [lump no longer]
|stick together,⁵ there, it is to be made [lawful] only by piercing [them]
|one by one.

[If] the pulp inside the fruit of the wood apple, etc., remains having
|removed the shell,⁶ it is to be caused to be made lawful having made it

f-f ≠ Sp IV 767,25–68,1 g-g ≠ Sp IV 768,3–9

¹ Since *chedana* is in a dvandva compound here with *sūci* and *nākha* and is in
|the genitive, it cannot mean cutting in this context but rather stands for a tool
|for cutting.

² Sp IV 767,20f. explains that they are blunt (*atikhīṇa*) and therefore cannot be
|used.

³ Similarly Sp IV 767,29–68,1; Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 195] with 1288, n. 2.

⁴ *yāgu* may consist of the same grains as *odana* (see below, p. 347, n. 6), but it
|differs from the latter by its consistency; even when cooled it is liquid.

⁵ Even if lumps of rice are thrown into the gruel, the single rice grains fall apart.

⁶ Literally, the vessel (*kaṭāha*). The shell of the fruit of the wood-apple tree
(*Limonia acidissima*) is hard like a coconut shell. It is generally cut open. It is
clear that *kaṭāha* is used here for the shell as explained in Pāc-y 23,24ff.: *kaṭāhan*
ti (Sp IV 768,8) *ekāya bhājanavikatiyā nāmam etam. idha pama bijānam*
bhājanabhāvena tamsadisattā phalapheggū pi kaṭāhan ti vuccati. “Kaṭāha is

304 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨154⟩

break. If [the pulp] sticks together, it is suitable to make [it lawful] even in the shell.^g But whatever fruit is young, is without seeds, it may be eaten; and whatever [fruit] has fully developed seeds, [it] may be eaten after having removed the seeds. There is no necessity to make [them] lawful.

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) the plant category, (ii) knowing that it is the plant category, (iii) damaging or causing to damage (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [*sorts of*] *origin*), etc., are exactly the same as for [the rule about] digging the earth (Pāc 10 M).

The commentary on the rule about the plant category is finished.

[2. The commentary on the rule about one replying evasively]

[12. Pāc M: *In replying evasively, in causing trouble, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 48,16 = Vin IV 36,37)]

In the second [rule] “One replying evasively”¹ (*añña-vādako*) means: whatever matter a Vinaya expert asks about in the middle of the Saṅgha, he speaks about [something] other than that. This is a designation for someone evading one [question] by another. “One causing trouble” (*vihesako*) means: he gives trouble. This is a designation for one remaining silent.²

In replying evasively, in causing trouble, there is [an offence entailing] expiation (*aññavādake vihesake pācittiyam*, Pāt 48,16): In respect of these two subject matters, two [offences entailing] expiation are stated.^{3–h} Therefore, whichever bhikku has committed a remediable

^{h–h≠} Sp IV 770,8–12

the name of a type of a certain vessel. But here *kaṭāha* is said even with respect to the shell of the fruit on account of its similarity [with a *kaṭāha*] because it is a vessel for the seeds.”

¹ *añña-vādaka**; lit. “one who speaks about something else”, in the rule itself, *añña-vādake* as well as *vihesake* most probably do not refer to the person behaving in this manner but to the behaviour itself (Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II, 1291, n. 3).

² Or “for silence”. Sp IV 770,10 reads *tunhī-bhūtass*’ for *tunhī-bhāvassa*.

³ For this rule and its evaluation, see also Nolot 1999: 94.

⟨154⟩*Suddhapācittiya 12 M*

305

offence,¹ [and,] being questioned about it in the middle of the Saṅgha, not wishing to speak about it, covering one utterance with another, denies it in such-and-such a way, and whichever [bhikkhu] causes trouble by [maintaining] silence — for them, whatever formal acts for replying evasively and for causing trouble were prescribed by the Blessed One, that [formal act] being carried through by the Saṅgha,² there is [an offence entailing] expiation for them again acting thus (i.e. persisting in their behaviour).

[This rule] was prescribed at Kosambi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Elder Channa (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “evading one [question] with another” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation in respect of a lawful procedure.³ There is a triple [offence of] wrong doing in respect of an unlawful procedure.⁴ But for him against whom no charge was brought forward, either for speaking evasively or for causing trouble, acting thus (i.e. speaking evasively, etc.), it is only [an offence of] wrong doing⁵ (= 6. *[sorts of] offence*).

There is no offence for one not knowing the existence of an offence, asking, “What are you saying?”; or for one not speaking because of illness, or because of the intention, i—“There will either be quarrels, etc.,

i—i ≠ Vin IV 37,23ff.

¹ *sāvasesā āpatti*, an offence requiring removal, that is, one that can be cleared by expiation. This refers to all groups of offences except the Pārājika offences. The latter are considered irremediable (*anavasesa*), since the offender cannot be absolved of the offence. See NDB 1602, n. 66. See also Kkh-nṭ 360,16f.: *sāvasesam āpattim āpanno ti* (Kkh 154,18) *ettha thapetvā pārājikam sesā sāvasesāpatti nāma, tam āpanno*. “[Whichever bhikkhu] has committed a remediable offence: here aside from the offence entailing defeat, the remaining are called remediable offences; having committed [such] a one.”

² Bhikkhus speaking evasively are charged with speaking evasively (*aññavādakam ropeti*) in a procedure that is of the *ñatti-dutiya-kamma** type. Bhikkhus who cause trouble are charged for that in another procedure, which also is a *ñatti-dutiya-kamma* (Vin IV 36,33ff.).

³ Vin IV 37,16–19 (BD II 233).

⁴ Vin IV 37,19–21 (BD II 233)

⁵ Vin IV 37,9–14 (BD II 232f.).

306 *Bhikkhupātimokkha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨155⟩

for the Saṅgha,⁻ⁱ ⟨155⟩ j—or they will carry out a procedure either unlawfully or by an incomplete [community] or on someone¹ not liable to that procedure”;^{-j} [90] and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) a charge being brought forward by a lawful procedure, (ii) being questioned about the offence or the subject matter, (iii) because of the desire to cover up [an offence] evading one [question] by [asking] another or remaining silent (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [*sorts of*] *origin*), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] taking what is not given (Pār 2 M),

but [the offence against this rule originates in] activity or inactivity (= 11. *activity*),

and is [done with] an unpleasant [type of] feeling (= 17. *feeling*).

The commentary on the rule about replying evasively is finished.

[3. The commentary on the rule about disparaging]

[13. Pāc M: *In respect of disparaging [and] publicly criticising, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 48,18 = Vin IV 38,23)]

In the third [rule], by whatever utterance they disparage [a bhikkhu] saying, “So-and-so does this because of desire”, etc., [and,] as such ones who are desirous of defaming him, who cause bhikkhus to despise² an ordained [bhikkhu] agreed upon by the Saṅgha as one being a distributor of lodgings, etc., to look down on [him] with disrespect, or

j-j≠ Vin IV 37,26f.

¹ See Vjb 298,25–99,2: *adhammena vā vaggena vā na kammārahassa vā ti* (Vin IV 37,26f.) ettha “mayi vutte manū vā aññām vā saṅgo adhammena vā kammām, vaggena vā kammām karissati, na kammārahassa vā me, aññassa vā kammām karissatī ti na kathetī ti yojetabbam. “**Either unlawfully, or by an incomplete [community], or on one not liable to [that procedure]**” means: here it is to be [syntactically] construed [as follows]: he does not speak [thinking], ‘If I say it, the Saṅgha will unlawfully or as an incomplete [communion] carry out a procedure against me or someone else’; or, ‘It will carry out a procedure against me or someone else, not liable to that procedure.’”² For this construction of a double causative with accusative and instrumental, see von Hinüber 1968: § 118.

² For this construction of a double causative with accusative and instrumental,

⟨155⟩

Suddhapācittiya 13 M

307

to think of [him] as bad,¹ that [type of] utterance is disparaging (*ujjhāpanakam*).

And by what [utterance], speaking just that way, they publicly criticise [an ordained bhikkhu],² they denigrate him everywhere, ^k—that is publicly criticising (*khiyyanakam*).

*In respect of disparaging [and] publicly criticising there is [an offence entailing] expiation³ (*ujjhāpanake khiyyanake pācittiyam*, Pāt 48,18): In respect of these two subject matters, two [offences entailing] expiation are stated.^k Therefore, whoever, out of a desire to defame a bhikkhu who has been agreed upon,⁴ speaking to the ordained,⁵ disparages or publicly criticises [him], for him there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

[This rule] was prescribed at Rājagaha (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the bhikkhus Mettiya and Bhūmajaka (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “disparaging and publicly criticising” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

^{k–k}Sp IV 771,6f.

see von Hinüber 1968: § 118.

¹ For the construction of this sentence compare Khuddas-nt 316,26–17,1: *saṅgha-sammataṁ senāsanapaññāpakādibhedam upasampannam ayasakāmā hutvā bhikkhūhi yena ca ujjhāpentī avajānāpentī avaññāya olokāpentī, lāmakato vā cintāpentī, tam vacanam ujjhāpanakam*.

² *ujjhāpanaka* bhikkhus either cause others to think badly of a bhikkhu or directly criticise a bhikkhu. See Vmv II 13,20ff.

³ Kkh 155,17f. has “*tasmiṁ ujjhāpanake khiyyanake. pācittiyam ti ...*”, taking “*tasmiṁ ... khiyyanake*” as the end of the preceding sentence, and *pācittiyam* as the *pratīka* of the next. The explanation given in the commentary clearly shows that here, *pācittiyam* is not explained as a single word, but in connection with the preceding two words, that is, *ujjhāpanake khiyyanake*. This, incidentally, is exactly parallel to the construction in Pāc 12 M (Kkh 154,17f.). A full stop should therefore be inserted after *khiyyanakam* (Kkh 155,17), and “*tasmiṁ ujjhāpanake khiyyanake*” (the last two words in italics as part of the *pratīka*) should be put in a new line forming one sentence with the subsequent *pācittiyam* (Kkh 155,18).

⁴ That is, agreed upon by the Saṅgha for one of the different offices within the Saṅgha.

⁵ *upasampannassa* is the object to *vadanto*. Unlike in the case of disparaging someone, in the case of criticising, one speaks directly to the person concerned.

308 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* **〈156〉**

^a—Whatever procedure for agreeing upon¹ was carried out for that ordained one,^a with respect to that lawful procedure there is a triple [offence entailing] expiation,² with respect to an unlawful procedure there is a triple [offence of] wrong doing.³ But there is only [an offence of] wrong doing for one speaking thus in the presence of one who is unordained, and for one denigrating a person not agreed upon,⁴ in the presence of someone or other, and for one denigrating one who is unordained whether agreed upon or not agreed upon, in the presence of someone or other⁵ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one disparaging or publicly criticising someone acting habitually by virtue of desire, etc.,⁶ 〈156〉 and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

These are the six constituent factors here: (i) being agreed upon by a lawful procedure, (ii) being ordained, (iii) the absence of following a wrong course,⁷ (iv) the desire to denigrate him, (v) the one in whose

^a—^aSp IV 771,20

¹ This refers to the procedures by which bhikkhus are publicly placed in office; they are verbally agreed upon as responsible for the various tasks of the community.

² Vin IV 38,30–33 (BD II 233). If we follow Sp IV 771,19ff., *dhamma-kamma* is understood here as referring to the legal procedure with which the bhikkhu has been agreed upon (*sammuti-kamma*) for a position in the Saṅgha.

³ Vin IV 39,4ff. (BD II 233). Kkh 155,24, mentions three offences of wrong doing (*tika-dukkatam*) regarding an unlawful procedure, but the Vinaya mentions only two offences of wrong doing, stating that there is no offence if it is an unlawful procedure and if one thinks it is an unlawful procedure (Vin IV 39,6f.). As noted by Thānissaro (2007: I 336f.) only the PTS edition has this reading. B^e, C^e, and S^e state an offence of wrong doing in this last case too.

⁴ An ordained or unordained person (see Vin IV 38,34ff.; 39,1ff.) can be “not agreed upon” (*asammata*) by the Saṅgha. Unlike what we would expect, this is not interpreted by the commentaries as referring to a person who does not hold an office in the Saṅgha but as referring to a person who holds an office, which, however, was transferred to that person not by agreeing upon him, but by transferring the task to him (*kevalam tav’ esa bhāro ti saṅghena āropita-bhāram*, Sp IV 771,28f.). For details regarding this new method, which dates back at least to the Andhakatthakathā, see Kieffer-Pülz 2010: Vjb [8]; 2013: II 1341, n. 20.

⁵ Vin IV 38,33–39,4 (BD II 237).

⁶ See Vin IV 39,8ff. (BD II 237) for the three other reasons (hatred, delusion, fear).

⁷ This refers to the exception that one who habitually acts from desire, hatred,

⟨156⟩*Suddhapācittiya 14 M*

309

[presence he is speaking being ordained, (vi) disparaging or publicly criticising (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] taking what is not given (Pār 2 M),

but [the offence against this rule is done with] an unpleasant [type of] feeling (= 17. *feeling*).

The commentary on the rule about disparaging is finished.

[4. The commentary on the first rule about furnishings]

[14. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu, having spread out or having had spread out in the open a bed or a seat or a mattress or a stool belonging to the Saṅgha, when departing, should neither put it away nor have it put away or should go without taking leave, there is [an offence entailing expiation].*

(Pāt 48,20–23 = Vin IV 39,25–28)]

In the fourth [rule], *belonging to the Saṅgha* (*saṅghikam*, Pāt 48,20) means: property of the Saṅgha. In respect of beds, etc., whatever is made in the shape¹ of a bed, all that is in fact (*yeva*) a bed. In respect of a seat, too, exactly this is the method. But having made a cover (*chavi*) with some cloth or other or with a lawful skin (*camma*),² having filled it with wool, leaves, grass, bark, or cloth — excluding human hair and *tālīsa* leaves³ — the furnishing (*senāsana*) that has been made is called a bolster (*bhisi*). It is suitable to sit down as well as lie down on that. And here there is even no restriction as to [its] measurement.

¹ delusion, or fear may be criticised (Vin IV 39,9f.).

² °*saṅkhepena*; the commentaries do not explain this. In Sanskrit *saṅkṣepam* and *saṅkṣepatas* are used in the sense of “briefly, concisely, in short” (MW s.v. *saṅkṣepa*); this is the most common meaning also in Pāli (see *PED* s.v. *saṅkhepa* 2). In cases such as the present one, however, °*saṅkhepena* is replaced in the commentaries by °*ākārena* “in the shape, in the manner” (Sp-ṭ I 168,3 = Vmv I 34,2; Sp-ṭ I 427,23f.; III 7,27 = Vmv II 6,5), or °*nihārena* “in the manner, fashion” (Sp-ṭ I 431,28–32,1; II 392,23f.), or °*niyāmena* “in a specified manner” (Sv-pt I 430,21f.; 440,16f.).

³ For the allowances to use skins, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 201].

³ *tālīsa*, together with other substances, is allowed in the Vinaya as an ointment powder (*añjanupapisana*) in case of an eye disease (Vin I 203,16). IBH (BD IV 275, n. 9) identifies it with *Flacourzia cataphracta*. This is taken up by Cone in DOP s.v. *tālīsa*: “a fragrant shrub (*Flacourzia cataphracta*?); a perfume

310 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨157⟩

But a stool (*koccha*) — consisting of one or other of bark, roots [of a grass] (*usīra*), *muñja* grass, [or] reeds [that are] tied up after ^b—having twisted them together in the middle¹ and having spread [them] out below and above^{—b}—has the form of a *pāñava* drum;² ^c—in the middle a lion skin, etc., is put around. There is no unlawful skin here indeed³ because a furnishing (*senāsana*), even consisting of gold, is suitable.^{—c}

In the open (*ajjhokāse*, Pāt 48,²¹) means: [91] here, the eight months not styled as belonging to the rainy season, thus not named “months of the rainy season”; aside from those, in the other four months (i.e. in the rainy season), even if it does not rain,⁴ nevertheless, it is not suitable to spread [them] out in the natural open [space] or in a shed exposed to the rain. But where it rains in the winter, it is not suitable there, even for these other four months.⁵ But in the summer, the sky is clear everywhere with the clouds gone away; therefore, if one goes away then, on account of anything to be done, it is suitable. But it is never suitable at the foot of a tree that is the constant dwelling place of crows, etc.⁶ Thus, where and when ⟨157⟩ it is not suitable to spread [them] out, all that is to be understood here as [what] comes to be called “in the open” indeed.

Having spread out (*santharītvā*, Pāt 48,²¹) means: having spread out in such a place for one’s own or someone else’s sake. For even if it is spread out for someone else’s sake, as long as he does not sit down there

^{b—b}≠ Sp IV 774,7f. ^{c—c}≠ Sp IV 774,9ff.

prepared from it”. According to Kkh-nt 363,15f., *tālīsa* leaves are pure *tamāla* leaves (*suddham tamālapattam*). *Tamāla*, according to Cone, is “Joseph’s coat, *Amaranthus dubius Mart.*” (DOP s.v.). Further identifications are found in MW s.v. *tamāla*.

¹ Based on Vin IV 40,11f.

² A type of hourglass drum.

³ It is necessary to stress the fact that there is no unlawful skin regarding their usage (*paribhoga*) for beds, etc., since with respect to carrying skins around (*pariharaṇa*) there are forbidden skins, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 201].

⁴ Kkh 156,24 has a full stop after *vassati*. This should be deleted since the sentence continues.

⁵ These are months during which it is normally allowed to spread out or have spread out beds, etc., in a hut or at the foot of a tree where crows do not leave droppings, see Vin IV 39,35–40,2 (BD II 239).

⁶ Because such places are explicitly excluded from the allowance in the Vinaya (Vin IV 39,35–40,2, BD II 239).

⟨157⟩

Suddhapācittiya 14 M

311

or does not say, “You go”, so long is it the responsibility only of the one who spread [them] out.

Having had spread out (santharāpetvā, Pāt 48,21) means: having caused [them] to be spread out by one who is unordained. For this indeed is an impediment for him. [When it is] spread out by an ordained [person], it is the responsibility only of the one who spread [them] out, and that is so as long as the one giving the order does not sit down there or does not say, “You go.” For whichever [seat] an ordained [person] sits [on that was] caused by him to be spread out or [that was] habitually spread out,¹ all that is the responsibility of the one sitting on it; therefore, it is called in fact “that having been caused to be spread out”.

When departing, should neither put it away nor have it put away (tam pakkamanto n’ eva uddhareyya, na uddharāpeyya, Pāt 48,22) means: should either not put it in an appropriate place when lifting it up by himself or should not cause it to be done thus by another.

Or should go without taking leave (anāpuccham vā gaccheyya, Pāt 48,23):² c’—whatever bhikkhu or novice or monastery attendant is modest, considering [the furnishing of the departing bhikkhu] as though it were an obstacle for himself,³—c’ not taking leave of such a one, not handing over his furnishings to him, [if a bhikkhu] goes away indifferent, if he goes beyond a stone’s throw of a man of medium strength, for him there is [an offence of] wrong doing in going beyond the stone’s throw by a single footstep; there is [an offence entailing] expiation in going beyond [that distance] by a second footstep. But standing in the eating hall, having sent [a message,] “Having made [a seat] ready in

c’—c’ Sp IV 776,27f.

¹ Kkh-nt 364.8f. explains that it is habitually spread out, but it is neither caused to be spread out by oneself nor spread out by oneself.

² IBH translated “asking [for permission]” (BD II 239); Norman and Pruitt “asking leave” (Pāt 49). As stated by Thānissaro (2007: I 340) āpucchati here cannot mean “asking for permission” because nowhere in the Pāli canon is it expected that a bhikkhu should ask a lay person’s permission. What is meant is that a bhikkhu should take leave when he departs.

³ That means that each of these persons can be assumed to care for the departing bhikkhu’s furnishing very well because they consider his matters as if they could create an obstacle for themselves.

312 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨158⟩

such-and-such a place for resting during the daytime, go”, going forth from there, in going elsewhere, he is to be dealt with in accordance with the raising of his foot.¹

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning many bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “departing without putting away what was spread out nor taking leave” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.² In respect of an item belonging to an individual there is a triple [offence of] wrong doing.³ It is only [an offence of] wrong doing for one going, having placed in the open air with the stated characteristics, ^d-an undermat,⁴ or upper covering, or ground covering, or straw mat, or piece of [animal] skin, or foot-wiping [cloth], or a wooden chair,^{-d} or whatever other wooden ware, clay ware, even ⟨158⟩ a bowl holder.

But if there is no place sheltered from the rain [in a wilderness], it is suitable that a wilderness dweller (*āraññaka*) goes away after attaching everything to a tree or having so acted that it may not be eaten up by termites. But by one living in the open air (*abbhokāsika*),⁵ it must be protected even by making a tent⁶ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

^{d-d}Vin IV 40,26

¹ *pāduddhārena kāretabbo*. For details, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II 1306 [Z 200] [1]. For *pāduddhāra*, see above, p. 104, n. 1.

² Vin IV 40,22–26 (BD II 241f.).

³ Vin IV 40,29–32 (BD II 242).

⁴ See DOP s.v. *cimilikā* “a strip of cloth; an (under-)mat of strips of cloth?”. Von Hinüber (1967: 248 [English translation: 1994: 3]) refers to the fact that *ulloka* (an underlay between the wickerwork of a woven bed and the mattress) is a synonym for *cimilikā* in Sp VI 1218,31f.: *ullokaṃ akaritvā ti* (Vin II 150,38–51,1) *hetṭhā cimilikam adatvā*. “Not having made an underlay means: not having given an undermat underneath.”

⁵ This is one of the thirteen *dhutāṅgas* (“ascetic practices”) for bhikkhus. For the rules to be followed by an *abbhokāsika* (“[an ascetic] living in the open air”), see also Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 198].

⁶ Literally, “a hut of cloth”. As the commentary states, this can even be made with four layers of fabric (Kkh-nt 365,13f.).

<158>

Suddhapācittiya 15 M

313

There is no offence in respect of his own property; in respect of [belongings of] an individual taken on trust; in going away, having put [the furnishings] away, etc.; for one drying himself; for one going away, [thinking,] “I will come back and put [the furnishings] away”; [if] older people turn [him] out; [if] a non-human sits there; [if] some master (*issara*) takes it; [if] lions, etc., coming to that place stay there, thus the furnishings are obstructed; or similarly for one going away when the furnishings are obstructed [by someone or other]; or in the case of disasters which are obstacles to his life and chaste conduct; [92] and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the six constituent factors here: (i) the bed, etc., being the property of the Saṅgha, (ii) spreading [it] out or having [it] spread out in a place with the stated characteristics, (iii) there being no obstruction, (iv) absence of disasters, (v) indifference, (vi) going beyond a stone’s throw (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [*sorts of*] *origin*), etc., are exactly the same as for the first *kathina* [rule] (Niss 1 M),

but [the offence against] this [rule originates in] activity and inactivity (= 11. *activity*).

The commentary on the first rule about furnishings is finished.

[5. The commentary on the second rule about furnishings]

15. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu, having spread out a bed or having had it spread out in a dwelling place belonging to the Saṅgha, when departing should neither put it away nor have it put away or should go without taking leave, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 50,2ff. = Vin IV 41,21–24)]

In the fifth [rule] *in a dwelling place* (*vihāra*, Pāt 50,2) means: in a room (*gabbha*)¹ or in another protected² lodging [place that is] fully enclosed.

¹ *gabbha* refers to an inner room in a *vihāra*, that is, a cell.

² Kkh B^e E^e *vutta-senāsane*, C^e *gutta-senāsane*. The variant *vutta-senāsane* is suspicious in that it is not preceded by the name of a source or by some adverb like *pubbe* referring back to an earlier statement. Actually, the Sinhalese edition reads *gutta-senāsana*, a reading confirmed by the parallel in Sp IV 778,5f.: ... *vihāro ti antogabbho vā aññam vā sabbaparicchannam guttasenāsanam*. In Sp all editions read *gutta*^o. This Sp statement is also quoted in Vin-vn-t I 422,25f. with the reading *gutta*^o. In addition, Mūlas-t 481,20ff. (ad

314 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* 〈159〉

Bedding (*seyyam*, Pāt 50,2): It is said¹ [in the Vinaya], e—“Bedding² means: a bolster, an undermat, an upper covering, a ground covering, a mat, a piece of [animal] skin, a sitting [cloth], a spreading, a [layer of] strewn grass, a [layer of] strewn leaves.”—e There, “an undermat” (*cimilikā*, Kkh 158,23) is made to protect the colour of a floor which has been made by plastering [it].

“An upper covering” (*uttarattharāṇam*, Kkh 158,23) is a covering fit to be spread over beds, seats, etc.

“A ground covering” (*bhūmattharāṇam*, Kkh 158,23f) is a kind of straw matt (*kaṭa-sāraka*), etc., to be spread over an undermat if there is one, and if not, on the bare ground.

“A mat” (*taṭṭikā*, Kkh 158,24) is 〈159〉 a mat made from the leaves of the palmyra palm (*tāla*), etc.

“A piece of [animal] skin” (*cammakkhaṇḍo*, Kkh 158,24) means: whatever [animal] skin, for only in carrying [them] around is there a rejection³ of lion skins, etc., but with respect to [their] usage for furnishings (or lodgings) there is no unlawful [animal] skin.

e—e Vin IV 41,27ff.

Mūlas v. 37) in a similar passage reads *gutta°*: *tattha saṅghikāvasathe ti saṅghassa santake āvasathe vihāre gabbhe vā aññasmīm vā sabbaparicchinne guttasenāsane*. Accordingly, Kkh E^e 158,22 should be corrected to *gutta°*.

¹ The *ti vuttam* indicates a quotation from some canonical source (see Kieffer-Püll 2015a: 2.2). This explains why the passage begins with *seyyan ti* (Pāt 50,2) “*seyyā* (= Vin IV 41,27) *nāma* ...”; the first *seyyan* is the *pratīka* quoted from the Pātimokha and to be explained here; the *seyyā* before *nāma* is the *pratīka* quoted from the Pātimokha rule in the Word Analysis of the Vinaya. *Nāma* as well as the entire explanation is thus taken over by the author of Kkh from the Word Analysis of the Vinaya.

² Kkh 158,23 quotes the Vinaya explanation with *seyyā* for *seyyam*, though in the editions at our disposal only *seyyam* is transmitted. Either the author of Kkh had at his hands a Vinaya text reading *seyyā*, not *seyyam*, or *seyyā* occurred through inadvertence, since *seyyā nāma* is the reading in Vin IV 17,1 [Pāc 5 M] and 19,36 [Pāc 6 M].

³ Kkh 159,2 *parikkhepo* with C^e v.l. *akappiyaparibhogo nāma paṭikkhepo*. Though the reading of C^e is correct from the point of view of content, it is not to be considered the original reading, but rather a gloss that slipped into the text. We should rather assume that *parikkhepo* is a wrong reading for *paṭikkhepo*, which is to be found in the parallel in Sp IV 776,9f.: *tasmā*

⟨159⟩

Suddhapācittiya 15 M

315

f—“A spreading” (*paccattharanam*, Kkh 158,24) means: a cotton covering¹ or a woolen covering.² Just this much [requires explanation],^{—f} the remainder is indeed well known.

Among these ten beddings thus [described], if a bhikkhu — having taken just one single bedding in accordance with his own rains (i.e. years spent as a bhikkhu), having spread it out or having had [it] spread out in a dwelling place with the stated characteristics, going off to [another] region — should neither put it away nor have it put away because of placing [it] thus [that] it may not be eaten up by termites, or should go off without taking leave in the manner stated in the previous rule, there is [an offence of] wrong doing for him in the first footstep of going beyond the enclosure of an enclosed monastery (*ārāma**) [or] of the precinct of one which is not enclosed. There is [an offence entailing] expiation in the second footstep. But where there is no danger of termites, it is suitable to go from there even without taking leave, but taking leave is the usual custom.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of seventeen bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “spreading their bedding in a dwelling place belonging to the Saṅgha, and departing without putting it away [or] taking leave” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

f—f ≠ Sp IV 777,10f.

sīhacammādīnam parihaṇe yeva paṭikkhepo veditabbo. “Therefore, only in the case of carrying around lion’s skins, etc., is a rejection [of this type of skin] to be known.” This is confirmed by the *pratīka* “*parihaṇe yeva paṭikkhepo*” in Kkh-nṭ 365,26. Accordingly Kkh 159,2, *parikkhepo* should be corrected to *paṭikkhepo*. For more details regarding the different ways of handling skins of lions, tigers, etc., see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 201], especially 1310, n. 2.

¹ *pāvāra*; made of cotton; see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 140], 951, n. 42; [Z 202], 1315, n. 4.

² *kojāva*; unlike the *pāvāra* it is made of wool, and can have long hair, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 140], 951, n. 44; [Z 202], 1315, n. 4.

316 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* 〈159〉

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ In respect of an [item] belonging to an individual, there is a triple [offence of] wrong doing.² It is only [an offence of] wrong doing for one who goes away having spread [bedding] or having caused it to be spread^{g, h-} in the precinct of a dwelling place^{-h} with the stated characteristics, [i.e. in a place] close by, [but] outside [of the *vihāra*],^{3-g} or in an assembly hall,ⁱ⁻ or in an unenclosed shed, or even in one that is enclosed which is the assembly place for many,⁴ or at the foot of a tree;⁵⁻ⁱ and having spread or caused to be spread, a bed and a seat either in a dwelling place or in the precinct of a dwelling place of the stated kind, without having put [them] away,⁶ etc. (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence in respect of his own property; in respect of [the belongings of] an individual taken on trust; in going away, having put [the furnishings] away, etc.; [in going away.] having abandoned [the furnishing that is] obstructed in exactly the [same] manner as in the previous [rule];⁷ and [there is no offence] for him who, with an interest [in the matter, says something] in the manner of, j—“Coming back this very day I will take care of it”, having gone to the other side of a river or to another village, wherever the thought of going arose in him, standing in that very place either takes leave having sent someone [to act on

^{g-h} ≠ Sp IV 778,6f. ^{h-h} Vin IV 42,9 ⁱ⁻ⁱ ≠ Vin IV 42,9f. ^{j-j} ≠ Sp IV 779,35–80,4

¹ Vin IV 42,4–9 (BD II 244f.).

² Vin IV 42,14ff. (BD II 245).

³ Kh 159,16f.: *vihārassa upacāre bahi āsanne* probably is the result of taking over part of the explanation from Sp IV 778,6f.: *vihārassa upacāre ti* (Vin IV 42,9) *tassa bahi āsanne okāse*. “**Within the precinct of the dwelling place** means: outside of it, in a location close by.”

⁴ That this belongs to the *maṇḍapa* becomes clear from the explanation of Sp IV 778,8ff.: *maṇḍape vā ti aparicchanne paricchanne vā pi bahunnam sannipāta-maṇḍape. rukkhamūle vattabbam natthi*. “**Or in a shed:** in a shed, unenclosed or even enclosed, which is an assembly place of many. Regarding the foot of a tree, nothing need be said.”

⁵ Vin IV 42,9ff. (BD II 245).

⁶ Vin IV 42,11–14 (BD II 245). In this case only an offence of wrong doing is incurred according to Sp IV 778,16–19, because a couch and a stool cannot be devoured by termites.

⁷ See Pāc 14 M, above, p. 313, where a lion prevents a bhikkhu from returning to his furnishing. The obstacles are described in more detail in Sp IV 776,31–77,2.

160*Suddhapācittiya 16 M*

317

[his behalf], or is unable to return as one being obstructed by one or other among a river flood or a king or robbers, etc.,^j and [there is no offence for one] in the case of disasters, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*). [93]

These are the seven constituent factors here: (i) bedding with the stated characteristics, (ii) its being the property of the Saṅgha, (iii) spreading or causing to be spread in a dwelling place with the stated characteristics, (iv) not being obstructed, (v) the absence of a disaster, (vi) [a bhikkhu] who is indifferent going away to another place, (vii) going beyond the boundary of the precinct¹ (= 9. *constituent factors*). **160**

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are exactly the same as stated in the immediately preceding rule (Pāc 14 M).

The commentary on the second rule about furnishings is finished.

[6. The commentary on the rule about encroaching]

[16. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu in a dwelling place belonging to the Saṅgha should knowingly make his bed encroaching on a bhikkhu who arrived before him [thinking], “He for whom it is too crowded will go away”, having done it for that reason and no other, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 50,7–10 = Vin IV 43,7–10)]

In the sixth [rule] ^k-knowingly (*jānam*, Pāt 50,7) means: knowing (*jānanto*), “This [person] is not to be turned away.” Therefore, indeed, it is said in the Word Analysis of this [word in the Vinaya], ^a—“He knows [this person] is old; ^k he knows [this person] is ill; he knows [a dwelling place] was given [to this person] by the Saṅgha.”^{2-a b}—For an old man is not to be turned away because of his old age, an ill man because of his illness. But a Saṅgha, having considered the great usefulness of treasurers (*bhaṇḍāgārika*), and the distinction of virtues³ of preachers

^k–^k ≠ Sp IV 780,14f. ^a–^a Vin IV 43,13f. ^b–^b ≠ Sp IV 780,15–20

¹ This refers to the boundary of the precinct of a vihāra.

² Vin E^e reads *saṅghassa dinno* without v.l.; Vin B^e has *saṅghena dinno*. In Kkh 160,9 this passage from the Vinaya is quoted as *saṅghena dinno*, and similarly in Khuddas-pt 133,8; Khuddas-nt 320,20f.; Vin-vn-t I 424,15.

³ According to the commentaries, *bahu-upakāra-bhāvam* is to be linked with

318 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨160⟩

(*dhamma-kathika*), Vinaya experts (*vinaya-dhara*), [and] teachers, who are reciters of groups (*gana-vācaka*);¹ [and] having considered [and] agreed upon² a dwelling place (*vihāra*) for permanent residence [for them], gives [dwelling places] to [them]. Therefore, even one to whom [a dwelling place] was given by the Saṅgha is not to be turned away.^{-b}

[One who] arrived before (*pubbupagatam*, Pāt 50,7) means: [one who] arrived before (resolution of compound).

Encroaching (*anupakhajjā*, Pāt 50,8) means: entering into the vicinity (*upacāra*) of [that bhikkhu's] bed and seat or [the vicinity] of that bhikkhu while he is entering or going out. There, ^cfirstly, in a large dwelling place, the vicinity of a bed and seat is one-and-a-half cubits (*hattha**) all around (ca. 60 cm); in a small [dwelling place], it is one-and-a-half spans (*vidatthi**) from where it starts.^{-c} But for one entering the vicinity (*upacāra*) [it extends] from the foot-washing stone to the bed and seat; for one going out, from the bed and seat to the urine place.³

Should make his bedding (*seyyam kappeyya*, Pāt 50,8) means: there is [an offence of] wrong doing for him spreading or having had spread out even a single one of the ten beddings in that vicinity out of a desire to make a constriction for him. There is [an offence entailing] expiation for him sitting or lying down there. For him doing both (i.e. sitting and

^c–^cSp IV 780,24ff.

bhanḍāgārika, whereas *guna-visiṭṭha* is to be connected with *dhamma-kathika*^o (Sp-t III 30,26ff. = Kkh-nt 368,8ff.). The remaining groups are not considered. Actually, one would think that *bahūpakāratam* and *gunavisitthatam* are to be connected with all the groups, i.e. “having considered the great usefulness and distinction of the virtues of treasurers, preachers, Vinaya experts, [and] teachers who are reciters of groups”.

¹ ^o*gana-vācakācariyānām*; the various commentaries take *ācariyānām* as belonging to *gana-vācaka* only, not to the earlier members of the compound. A *gana* is a group of bhikkhus. In the Pāli texts especially, a group of bhikkhus studying discourses (*sutta*) or philosophy (*abhidhamma*) are mentioned (Vism 93,24ff.; see also Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 621; Panabokke 1993: 178f.). A *vācaka*, “one who speaks”, is one who teaches such a group, as can be clearly seen at Vism 93,27–94,3.

² As stated by the commentary, this is agreed upon by an *apalokana-kamma** (Kkh-nt 368,13f.).

³ Sp, which largely has the same description, deviates in one point. This is discussed at some length in Vjb, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II 1320f., n. 5.

⟨161⟩*Suddhapācittiya 16 M*

319

| lying down), there are two [offences entailing] expiation. For him doing
| it again and again, there is [an offence entailing] expiation in accord-
| ance with the number of actions. **⟨161⟩**

| [This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the
| group of six bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter
| “making [one’s] bedding encroaching” (= 3. *subject matter*).
| [The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and
| bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

| It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

| There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ In respect of a [place]
| belonging to an individual there is a triple [offence of] wrong doing.²
| Outside the stated vicinity or in the assembly hall, etc., or in the precinct
| of a dwelling place, there is only [an offence of] wrong doing in spread-
| ing or having had spread, as well as in sitting and lying down³ (=
| 6. [sorts of] offence).

| There is no offence for one spreading [bedding] either in his own
| dwelling place or in one that is the property of a trusted friend, and for
| one who enters [into the vicinity] when ill or oppressed by cold and
| heat, and in the case of disasters, and for one who is insane, etc. (=
| 7. non-offence).

| These are the four constituent factors here: (i) the dwelling place
| belonging to the Saṅgha, (ii) the knowledge of the state that the person
| should not be turned away, (iii) the desire to encroach, (iv) sitting or
| lying down in [his] vicinity⁴ (= 9. *constituent factors*).

| The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are exactly the same as for
| the first [rule entailing] defeat (Pār 1 M),

| but the [offence against this rule is done with] an unpleasant [type
| of] feeling (= 17. *feeling*).

| The commentary on the rule about encroaching is finished.

¹ Vin IV 43,22–25 (BD II 248).

² Vin IV 43,31–34 (BD II 249).

³ Vin IV 43,25–31 (BD II 249).

⁴ In his vicinity or in the vicinity of his couch or bed.

320

Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation

⟨161⟩

[7. The commentary on the rule about throwing out]

[17. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should, being angry and displeased, throw a bhikkhu out from a dwelling place belonging to the Saṅgha or have him thrown out, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 50,12f. = Vin IV 44,31f.)]

In the seventh [rule]¹ angry (*kupito*, Pāt 50,12) means: angry (*kuddho*).

Displeased (*anattamano*, Pāt 50,12) means: with dissatisfied mind.

Should throw out or have [him] thrown out, [there is an offence entailing] expiation (*nikkaḍḍheyā vā nikkaḍḍhāpeyyā vā pācittiyam*, Pāt 50,13): here, whatever [94] multi-storey palaces there are, or square [buildings] with four halls (*catu-sālā*) with many gateways, for one having seized [a bhikkhu] in lodgings of that sort, and, without having stopped inside, ^d-making [him] pass [the lodging area] with just a single action, there is a single [offence entailing] expiation. For one making [the bhikkhu] pass [the lodging area] with various actions, having stopped several times, there are [offences entailing] expiation in accordance with the number of doors [passed by]. Exactly the same method [applies] even to one throwing out verbally, without touching him by the hand, [saying,] “Go out.”^d

But for one having [someone] thrown out, ^e-there is [an offence of] wrong doing in merely having ordered, “Throw him out.”² But if one ordered once, makes the one [to be thrown out] pass even through many doors, there is only a single [offence entailing] expiation for the other one (i.e. the one who gave the order).³ But if one is ordered, having [it] defined thus, “Throw him out through so many doors”, or “Throw him out as far as the great door”, there are [offences entailing] expiation in

^{d-d}Vin IV 40,26 ^{e-e}≠ Sp IV 781,26–31

¹ For the connection between this rule and a passage in the Cullavagga (Vin II 166,33–36), see von Hinüber 1999: 58.

² Compare Vin IV 45,7f.: *nikkaḍḍhāpeyyā ti* (Vin 44,32) *aññam āñāpeti, āpatti dukkaṭassa*. “[If a bhikkhu] should have him thrown out means: [if] he orders another one [to do so], it is an offence of wrong doing [for the one who gave the order].”

³ Vin IV 45,8f.: *sakim ānatto bahuke pi dvāre atikkāmeti, āpatti pācittiyassa*. “When once commanded, if he makes [the one to be thrown out] pass even through many doors, there is an offence [entailing] expiation [for the one who gave the command].”

⟨162⟩*Suddhapācittiya 17 M*

321

accordance with the number of doors [for the one who gives the order].^e

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to ⟨162⟩ the subject matter “throwing out from a dwelling place belonging to the Saṅgha” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ In respect of [a place] belonging to an individual, there is a triple [offence of] wrong doing.² It is only [an offence of] wrong doing (1) in throwing out the [bhikkhu’s] requisites; (2) in throwing out him or his requisites from the precinct of a dwelling place, the meeting hall, etc.; (3) in throwing out and having thrown out one who is unordained or an unordained [person]’s requisites from a dwelling place or the precincts of a dwelling place. But when the requisites are not fastened together, this [offence of wrong doing] is to be understood in accordance with the number of requisites (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence (1) in throwing out [a troublemaker (?)] from a dwelling place which is [the bhikkhu’s] own property or that of a trusted friend, (2) in throwing out or having thrown out a troublemaker or his requisites even from the Saṅgha’s entire monastery, (3) and in throwing out from his own dwelling place a shameless person [or] one who is insane, [or] pupils and co-residents whose conduct is bad, or their requisites, (4) and [there is no offence] for himself being insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) the dwelling place belonging to the Saṅgha, (ii) an ordained [bhikkhu] being free from the state of being a troublemaker, etc., (iii) throwing out or having thrown out because of anger (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] taking what is not given (Pār 2 M),

¹ Vin IV 45,10–14 (BD II 252).

² Vin IV 45,21ff. (BD II 252f.).

322 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨162⟩

but the [offence against this rule is done with] an unpleasant [type of] feeling (= 17. *feeling*).

The commentary on the rule about throwing out is finished.

[8. The commentary on the rule about a lofty hut]

[18. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should, in a dwelling place belonging to the Saṅgha, in a lofty hut in the upper part, sit down or lie down [suddenly]¹ on a bed or seat with detachable legs, there is [an offence entailing expiation].*

(Pāt 50,16–18 = Vin IV 46,16)]

In the eighth [rule]² f—*In a lofty hut, in the upper part (upari-vehāsa-kuṭiyā, Pāt 50,16)* means: in a two- or three-storeyed hut with an uncovered floor above.^{3–f} But in the Word Analysis [of the Vinaya] it is said, “It does not touch the head of a man of medium height” to show the hut intended here.

With detachable legs (āhaccapādakam, Pāt 50,17) means: with legs inserted into the rails [constituting the frame],⁴ after having [them] pierced.

He should sit down (abhinisīdeyya, Pāt 50,17) means: g—having mounted [the bed or seat],¹ having covered [it], he should sit down;

f–f Sp IV 782,15f. g–g ≠ Sp IV 782,17–20

¹ This “suddenly” (*sahasā*) is not contained in the rule, but given in the classification as belonging to the rule, see Kkh 163,8. For a discussion of the necessity of *sahasā* in the rule, see Thānissaro 2007: I 348.

² For the connection between this rule and a passage in the Cullavagga (Vin II 149,19ff.), see von Hinüber 1999: 64.

³ Whereas in the rule, *uparivehāsakuṭi* could be understood as the upper story (*upari*) of a lofty cell (*vehāsa-kuṭi*) or as the upper lofty cell (*upari-vehāsa-kuṭi*) of a vihāra, this is no longer possible in the introductory story. There, *upari-vehāsa-kuṭi* itself is described as a two-storeyed building. In the Word Analysis only *vehāsa-kuṭi* is explained, which shows that the commentators did not understand *upari-vehāsa-kuṭi* as a fixed compound describing a sort of building. Regarding the different possibilities of understanding this compound, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 204] [1].

⁴ *aṅga* (C^e v.l. *aṅka*). Kkh-nṭ 369,22 explains *aṅge* by *ataniyo*. *Atani* describes the rails, which constitute the frame of a couch (CPD and DOP s.v. *atani*). Pālim-nṭ II 149,15ff. says the legs are inserted in the pierced rails and that a pin is then put on it from above.

⟨163⟩*Suddhapācittiya 18 M*

323

[alternatively, this is the accusative in the sense of the locative. The meaning is: he should sit down or should lie down on the bed or seat. ⟨163⟩]

Abhi: this, however, is a mere prefix for the purpose of embellishing the word.^g

Therefore, whatever bhikkhu sits down or lies down on a bed or seat with detachable feet, placed above the beams² of a lofty hut with the stated characteristics, that is at least so high^h—that the head of a medium-sized man does not touch the very lowest beams,^h for him there is [an offence entailing] expiation in accordance with the number of actions in the manner stated in the rule about encroaching (Pāc 16 M). [95]

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning a certain bhikkhu (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “sitting and lying down suddenly on a bed or seat with detachable legs in a lofty hut, in the upper part” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.³ In respect of a [place] belonging to an individual there is a triple [offence of] wrong doing⁴ (= 6. [sorts of] *offence*).

There is no offence for one sitting on a seat with detachable legs there in a dwelling place which is his own property or that of a trusted

^{h–h} ≠ Sp IV 782,23f.

¹ For this meaning of *abhibhavati*, see BHSD s.v. (not in Childers, CPD, DOP, PED). Actually, *abhibhavītā* takes up the *abhi* of *abhinisīdeyya*. The parallel in Sp IV 782,16ff. shows that the bed (*mañca*) and, in analogy, the stool (*pīṭha*) are considered the objects of *abhibhavītā* and *ajjhottarītā*.

² The idea that a bed or seat could be made on the beams forming the ceiling of a lofty hut, can be found again in Pāc 87 M which prohibits that a bhikkhu makes or causes to be made a new bed or seat with feet longer than eight fingers (*aṅgula**). One of the cases where no offence arises, even if the bed has longer feet, is the case that the bed or seat is lifted, and placed on the beams forming a platform there, see below, p. 491, n. 2.

³ Referring to Vin IV 46,27–30 (BD II 255f.).

⁴ Referring to Vin IV 46,31ff. (BD II 256).

324 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* 〈163〉

friend, in what is not a lofty hut,¹ in a [lofty hut] touching the head,² or [in a lofty hut] i—whose³ lower [storey] is not in use because materials of wood, etc.,^{4–i} are deposited [there],⁵ or [whose] upper floor is either fitted with boards or j—plastered with cement, etc.;⁶ and [there] j is no offence] if one who is standing on a [bed or seat] with detachable legs — even when it is standing in the air (*vehāsaṭṭhā*)⁷ — grasps [something] or hangs something up; and [there is no offence] for him, to which a peg⁸ is given, the peg being inserted on top of the end points⁹ of the feet, if he sits there; and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

i–i ≠ Sp IV 783,4f. j–j Sp IV 783,7f.

¹ Explained by the commentary as a hut built from leaves on the earth (*bhūmiyam kata-pañña-sālādīsu*, Kkh-nt 369,26f.). In such a hut no legs can fall down.

² This takes up the size mentioned in the definition of *upari-vehāsa-kuti* above. An *upari-vehāsa-kuti* that does not accord with this measurement does not come under this rule.

³ Kkh 163,12 *yassa*, Kkh C^e *yathā*. The parallel in Sp has *yassā*. This is what would be expected here too, since it refers to the *vehāsa-kuti*.

⁴ Or: wood, materials, etc.

⁵ In this case the upper floor is a *vehāsa-kuti* with a permeable floor, and the lower storey is not used by bhikkhus as living quarters, but rather to store material. Thus, even if a detachable leg fell down through the floor, it would not hit anyone.

⁶ In these two cases the floor of the upper storey is no longer a permeable area, and thus, detachable legs cannot fall down in the lower storey.

⁷ That is, even when the building is a *vehāsa-kuti*, and the bhikkhu uses a couch, etc., with detachable legs, it is no offence, if he stands on that couch, etc., to take something down from somewhere or to hand something up. In that case his action is different from the action covered by the rule, and to that extent he is not guilty.

⁸ Kkh-nt 370,6: *paṭipakkhabhūtā āñi paṭāñi* (Kkh 163,15). “**Paṭāñi**” means: a peg that is an obstacle.”

⁹ *pādasīsānam upari*; Sp IV 783,9, in a slightly different parallel, reads *pāda-sikhā* “top edge of the [bed’s] legs”. Sp IV 774,5f.: *āhaccapādako ti* (Vin IV 40,6 [Pāc 14 M]) *ayam pana āhaccapādako nāma mañcaṅge vijjhītvā kato hotī ti evam parato pāliyam yeva vutto, tasmā aṭāniyo vijjhītvā tattha pāda-sikhām pavesetvā upari āñim datvā katamañco āhaccapādako ti veditabbo.* Vin-vn-t I 416,15–18, gives the following explanation: *āhaccapādako nāma aṭāniyo vijjhītvā aṭāničidde pādasīse sikhām katvā tam pavesetvā aṭāniyā upari nikkhante pādasikhāmatthake tiriyan vijjhītvā āñim pavesetvā kata-mañco.* “[A couch] with **detachable** legs means: having pierced the rails [of

These are the four constituent factors here: (i) a dwelling place belonging to the Sangha, (ii) a lofty cell which does not touch the head, (iii) the lower [floor] being in use, (iv) sitting down or lying down on a [bed or a seat with] detachable legs with no pin provided (= 9. constituent factors).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] sheep's wool (Niss 16 M).

The commentary on the rule about a lofty hut is finished.

9. The commentary on the rule about a large dwelling place

[19. Pāc M: *When a bhikkhu is having a large dwelling place made, the perimeter¹ for two or three coverings [of plaster] as far as the area around the door (dvāra-kosa*) may be determined by him standing in a place without green crops, for fixing the door panel (aggala),² for preparing the window shutters.³ If he should determine more than that,*

the frame], having made the end of the legs the top edge, having inserted them in the holes of the rails, having pierced horizontally the tips of the top edges of the legs protruding above the frame, having inserted the peg, the couch is built.”

¹ *pariyāya*. *Pariyāya* (nt.) has been interpreted by Schlingloff (1963: 542) as “Umgang”, that is, a passage encircling the vihāra. “Läßt ein Mönch eine geräumige (*mahallaka*) Versammlungshalle (*vihāra*) errichten, so ist durch zwei- bis dreimaliges Bedecken (*Pa dvitticchadanassa*) [des Bodens] ein Umgang (*Pāli pariyāya*) [um die Halle] herzustellen (Skt *vyādhisṭātavyā*, *Pāli adhiṭṭhātabbam*) um einen Verriegelungsbalken anbringen zu können ...”. Such an encircling area to our knowledge is not labeled as *pariyāya*. In Sgh 6 M an area such as this is referred to by the word *saparikkamanā* (*Pāt 14,10f.*), see above, p. 144.

² In *Pāt 51* this had been translated as “as far as the doorway for placing the door-bolts”. Alternatively *aggala* could be understood as a “door bolt”, and the passage translated as: *for fixing [the door] with a door bolt*. For details, see Appendix 29.

³ *ālokasandhi-parikammāya*; in *Pāt 51* this had been translated as “for making the window holes”. Though *ālokasandhi* can mean the window holes (CPD, DOP s.v.), the explanations of the commentaries show that it is the shutters which hit the wall when opened (also CPD, DOP s.v.). In the Pātimokkha rule itself bhikkhus are allowed to have the areas around the door and the windows plastered up to three times in order to make the plastering more durable and thus more resistant when door panels and window shutters knock against them.

326 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* 〈164〉

even if standing in an area without green crops, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.

(Pāt 50,20–24 = Vin IV 47,22–26)¹

In the ninth [rule] *large* (*mahallakam*, Pāt 50,20) means: having a patron.²

Dwelling place (*vihāram*, Pāt 50,20) means: [One] plastered inside and outside.³ 〈164〉

^k—*As far as the area around the door*⁴ (*yāva dvārakosā*, Pāt 50,21): here, “area around the door” (*dvāra-kosa**) means an area at most two-and-a-half cubits (*hattha*; i.e. ca. 1 m) all around the door frame⁵ (*pitṭha-saṅghāṭa*).^{-k}

^a—*For fixing the door panel*⁶ (*aggalatthapanāya*, Pāt 50,21) means: for the stability of the door frame (*dvāra-bandha**)⁷ with its door panel (*kavāṭa*).^{-a} ^b—*For the door panel turning lightly strikes the wall at the time of opening; the door frame, at the time of closing.* Because of that

^k—^k ≠ Sp IV 783,18f.

^a—^a ≠ Sp IV 783,26ff.

^b—^b Sp IV 783,30–84,7

¹ Pāc 19 M belongs to the rules misunderstood by the authors of the introductory stories in the *Suttavibhaṅga* (see Schlingloff 1963: 542). Neither IBH’s translation (BD II 257f.), nor Schlingloff’s (1963: 542) attempt leads to a meaningful interpretation. In Nāṇasūta’s (2014: 184) translation the passage *yāva dvārakosā aggalatthapanāya* seems to be misunderstood. Thānissaro (2007: I 349) gives a meaningful understanding roughly according with our translation.

² This explanation is similar to the one in the Word Analysis (Vin IV 47,27).

³ That plastering was considered an essential element is also visible from the discussion in the frame of Sgh 6 M. Here a Saṅghādisesa offence arises at the very moment the plastering of the hut (*kuti*) is completed. From that discussion it further becomes clear that if windows and doors are fixed (*thapana*) in a hut when it has been completely plastered, and if, because of that, cracks appear in the plaster, it makes a new plastering necessary, see Kieffer-Püllz 2013: I [Z 117].

⁴ “As far as the area around the door (*dvāra-kosa**)” in the rule was obviously used to indicate the width of the area on the wall of the *mahallaka vihāra* to be provided with two to three layers of coating.

⁵ *pitṭha-saṅghāṭa** (variants are *pitṭhi*⁹ or *pitṭha-saṅghāṭa(ka)*) most probably designates a door frame. PED (s.v. *saṅghāṭa* 5.) gives “door post, lintel”. By the time of the commentarial literature, *pitṭha-saṅghāṭa(ka)* designated either the door frame as a whole or the lintel.

⁶ Or: for fixing [the door] with a [door] bolt.

⁷ *dvāra-bandha**, not used in the canon, in the few references from the *Āṭṭhakathās*, refers to a door post or the entire door frame (Sp IV 783,27, 31 = Kh 164,3, 5, see above).

⟨164⟩

Suddhapācittiya 19 M

327

striking the wall shakes, then the clay moves. Having moved, it becomes loose or falls off. Therefore the Blessed One said, “*For fixing the door panel as far as the area around the door.*” (*yāva dvārakosā aggalaṭṭha-panāya*, Pāt 50,21)¹ There, although “This indeed is to be done” is not said in either the Pātimokkha or the Word Analysis [of the Vinaya], but because of the topic (*adhikāra*) in the introductory story² [of Pāc 19 M, namely,]: c—“again and again he had [the dwelling place] roofed, again and again he had [it] plastered”,^{3–c} the meaning is to be shown thus: [the dwelling place] is to be plastered or caused to be plastered again and again *for fixing the door panel (aggala) as far as the area around the door.*^{4–b}

d—*For preparing the window shutters (ālokasandhiparikammāya*, Pāt 50,21): here the panels of the window are called “window shutters”. At the time of opening they strike a part of the wall measuring a span (*vidatthi**, i.e. 22 cm) or more. But the surrounding space (*upacāra*) here is possible in all directions; therefore, in all directions, a space the size of the breadth of the window is to be plastered or caused to be plastered for preparing the window shutters. That is the intention here.^{–d}

e—Thus, having shown what is to be done regarding the work of plastering, now, to show what is to be done regarding the covering, [the Vinaya] says, “*for two or three coverings*”, etc.

There, *a perimeter of two or three coverings (dvatticchadanassa pariyyāyam*, Pāt 50,22) means: two or three perimeters of the covering; perimeter (*pariyāya*) is called circumference (*parikkhepa*). The meaning is: two circumferences or three circumferences are to be determined.

By him standing in a place without green crops (*appaharite thitenā*, Pāt 50,22) means: by him standing where there are no green crops. And “green crops” (*haritam*)⁵ is here intended as [96] unprepared pulses like

^{c–c}Vin IV 47,6, 14f. ^{d–d}Sp IV 784,16–21 ^{e–e}Sp IV 784,25–32

¹ Or: for fixing [the door] with a door bolt as far as the area around the door.

² Literally: “in the arising of the matter” (*atṭhuppatti**).

³ This stems from the introductory story (Vin IV 47,6, 14f), which does not accord with the rule itself, see above, p. 325, n. 2.

⁴ Alternative translation as above, p. 326, n. 6.

⁵ In Kkh 164,23 written in italics as if it is a quotation from the Pātimokkha, which it is not, however. It rather is taken out of the preceding compound *appaharite* and *aharite*.

328 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* 〈165〉

the seven kinds of grain, etc., and prepared pulses like mung beans, beans, sesame, vetch, pumpkins, gourds, etc.¹ Whatever ^f is sown in a given¹ field and is not growing yet, but 〈165〉 when the rain has fallen will grow, even that is counted as “green crops”. Therefore, ^f determining while standing in such a [place] he commits [an offence of] wrong doing.

Even for one determining while standing where there are no green crops, ^g there is the following restriction: a man seated on the side of the central rafter² or of the dome of a gabled-house,³ looking down by the edge of the rim of the covering, in whatever part of the ground he sees a bhikkhu standing and where [the bhikkhu] standing looking in the same way up to him sitting above sees him,^g in that [place] he must stand. It is not suitable to stand inside that, even if [it is] in [an area where] there are no green crops.

If [he should determine] more than that (tato ce uttari, Pāt 50,23) means: if [he should determine] more than three “ways” (i.e. straight lines), in case it is being covered in the manner of “the way” (i.e. a straight line);⁴ if more than three circles, in case it is being covered in

^{f-f} ≠ Sp IV 785,1-4 ^{g-g} ≠ Sp IV 785,5-9

¹ Kkh 164,25 reads *tasmin khetta*. Since no *khetta* was mentioned before, the *tasmin* does not seem to make sense. The parallel passage at Sp IV 785,1f. reads *yasmim pi khetta vuttam*. We would expect here either *yasmim* for *tasmin* or nothing at all. None of the commentaries take it up.

² *pīthi-vamsa**, describes the central beam or rafter of a house put over two traverse beams positioned on the corner pillars (Eggeling 1885: 3, n. 2; Renou 1939: § 10).

³ The parallel in Sp IV 785,5ff. deviates from Kkh in that it has three elements: “if he sits above the central rafter or the circular roof-plate of the gabled house or at the side of the dome (*pīthivāmsassa vā kūtagārakkāñnikāya vā upari thūpikāya vā passe nisinno*).

⁴ Whereas the covering in the rule itself is considered to be a covering of plaster on the walls of the building, namely surrounding the windows and the door, the authors of the introductory story interpreted it as a covering of the roof. Accordingly, the author of Kkh here gives an interpretation of covering in the sense of roofing. With respect to such roofing two ways are differentiated, roofing in the manner of the way, that is, straight, or in the manner of a surrounding space, that is, in circles. For that, see Kkh-nt 371,19: *tattha maggena chādiyā-māne ti* (Kkh 165,8) *aparikkhipitvā ujukam eva chādiyamāne. pariyyānenā ti* (Kkh 165,9) *parikkhepena*. “There, in case it is being covered in the manner

165*Suddhapācittiya 19 M*

329

the manner of circles;¹ in case it is being covered with tiles, stones, and lime² [there is an offence entailing expiation] in accordance with the number of tiles, stones, and lumps of lime; in case it is being covered with grass and leaves, there is [an offence entailing] expiation in accordance with the number of the leaves and the number of the whisps³ of grass.⁴

[This rule] was prescribed at Kosambi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Elder Channa (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “causing to cover and causing to plaster again and again” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.⁵ It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking there are more when there are less than two or three circles, or for one who is in doubt⁶ (= 6. *[sorts of] offence*).

There is no offence in using whitewash, etc., in two or three circles or less than two or three circles, in a cave (*lena*), a cavern (*guhā*), a grass hut, etc., for the sake of another, for one having it done with his

of the way means: in case it is being covered just straight without encircling [it]; **in the manner of a surrounding passage** means: in the manner of encircling.”

¹ *pariyāya*; in the rule itself *pariyāya* most probably means “perimeter” (see above, p. 325, n. 1). When *pariyāya* is linked with the roofing of the *mahallaka vihāra* it is explained as meaning *parikkhepa* (Kkh 164,19ff.), “encircling”. Thus *pariyāya* then is to be understood as “circles”, and refers to a specific manner of roofing a *vihāra* with leaves and grass, namely one where these are put on the roof in circles (Kkh 165,9). An opposite way of roofing is one where bricks, stones, and mud are placed in straight lines. This is called “the manner of the way”. Nāṇadassana 2008, n. 119, explains the *magga* roofing as upright roofing (“aufrechte (*ujukam*) Dachdeckung”), the *pariyāya* roofing as parallel roofing (“parallele Dachdeckung”).

² Following Sp IV 785,11–14, Kkh-nṭ 371,20f., using bricks, tiles, and lime belongs to the covering in the manner of the way, that is, a straight covering.

³ *muṭṭhi* here is explained by *karaḷa* in Sp IV 785,26, Kkh-nṭ 371,26f.

⁴ Following Sp IV 785,17ff., Kkh-nṭ 371,21, covering with leaves and grass belongs to covering in the manner of a perimeter, that is, encircling.

⁵ Vin IV 48,14ff. (BD II 260).

⁶ Vin IV 48,16ff. (BD II 260).

330 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨166⟩

for a dwelling-house,¹ and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).¹

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) the fact of there being a large dwelling place, (ii) the fact of being a dwelling house for himself, (iii) the determining in excess (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., are of exactly the manner stated in [the rule about] a go-between (Sgh 5 M).

The commentary on the rule about a large dwelling place is finished.

[10. The commentary on the rule about containing living beings]

[20. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should knowingly pour water containing living beings on to grass or earth or have it poured, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 52,2f. = Vin IV 49,3f.)]

In the tenth [rule] ^h-knowingly containing living beings (*jānam sappānakam*, Pāt 52,2) means: knowing [it] by some means or other, having seen or heard, “This has living beings in it”.^{–h}

ⁱ-Should pour or have it poured (*siñceyya vā siñcāpeyya vā*, Pāt 52,3) means: should himself pour with this water, or ordering another, should have it poured.^{–i} ^j-There, for one pouring in one pot, not interrupting the stream [of water], ⟨166⟩ there is only one offence.^{–j} ^k-For one interrupting [the stream] there are offences in accordance with the number of actions.^{–k} ^a-[If] he makes a watercourse² the spout,³ [if] it should flow

^{h–h}Sp IV 785,31f.
^{k–k}≠ Sp IV 786,5f.

^{i–i}≠ Sp IV 785,32–86,2
^{a–a}≠ Sp IV 786,6ff.

^{j–j}≠ Sp IV 786,3ff.

¹ Vin IV 48,21f. reads *vāsāgaram thapetvā sabbattha anāpatti*. “Except for a dwelling house, there is no offence anywhere [else].”

² *mātikā*, that is, an artificially created watercourse, Sp V 1054,31.

³ *pamukha* (Skt *pramukha*) among other things means “mouth”; since in the preceding example a bhikkhu poured water obviously from some pot, which normally is done via the spout, *pamukha* here might be used in the sense of “spout”— deduced from the function the artificially created water course has in the present example. In the literal parallel, in Sp IV 786,6f., we have *sammukham* without variants instead of *pamukham*. That this is not a misreading is shown by Vin-vn 1114f.: *sammukham pi karontassa mātikam sandamānakam, ekā eva siyāpatti divasam pi ca sandatu*. “For one making a flowing [artificial] water course being directed towards [himself], there would be only a

⟨166⟩

Suddhapācittiyā 20

331

even for a whole day, there is only a single offence. For one erecting [a dam]¹ here and there and leading water from elsewhere,^{-a} there are offences in accordance with the number of actions. For one throwing into the water by a single action, even a large amount of grass, leaves, branches, etc., there is only a single offence;² for one throwing them in one by one, there are offences in accordance with the number of actions.

^b—And this is said with reference to such water as goes to extinction or becomes dirty, when [greenery] is being thrown in so that living creatures die,^{-b} not with reference to a large expanse of water. In respect of having poured because of an order there is [an offence of] wrong doing. [If] one should pour even a large amount because of a single order, there is only a single [offence entailing] expiation for the one who gives the command.

[This rule] was prescribed at Ālavi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the bhikkhus at Ālavi (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “pouring [water]” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

^b—^b ≠ Sp IV 786,13ff.

single offence, even if it should flow for a whole day.” This passage is commented upon in Vin-vn-t I 435,23ff. [ad vv. 1114f.]: **mātikamp** ālim. **sammukham** karontassā ti udakam nhāyitum icchitam yadi, sayam abhimukham karontassa. “An [artificial] water course (=) a dyke. For him making [the water course] being directed towards [himself] means: if the water being wished [by him] for bathing, for him making [the water] turn towards himself.

¹ Erecting a dam is expressed among others possibilities by *pālim bandhati* (Sp V 1054,26f.). Therefore the *bandhati* in the present context can be understood as “damming”.

² This and the following example do not correspond to the rule as translated above. The basis for these examples is the translation of the rule by exchanging the objects which are both in the accusative: “If any bhikkhu should knowingly pour grass or earth into water containing living creatures or have it poured, there is an offence entailing expiation.” As pointed out by Thānissaro (2007: I 351f.), the verb *siñcati* is used for water only; therefore, this understanding of the rule is unlikely. Nevertheless, it is taken as one possibility by the commentator.

332 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨166⟩

There is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking that it contains living creatures when it does not contain living creatures, [97] [and] for one who is in doubt regarding both¹ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one thinking that it does not contain living creatures [when it does not contain living creatures], for one pouring unintentionally, or because of forgetfulness, for one not knowing, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

These are the four constituent factors here: (i) the fact of there being living creatures in the water, (ii) the knowledge that because of pouring living creatures will die, (iii) and the water being of exactly such a kind, (iv) the pouring [of water] on grass, etc., because of something or other that has to be done without the intention of killing (= 9. constituent factors).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] taking what is not given (Pāc 2 M),

but [the offence against this rule] is a fault according to a precept [laid down by the Buddha] (= 14. fault),

[is done with] three [types of] thought (= f16. thoughts),

[with] three [types of] feeling (= 17. feelings).

The commentary on the rule about containing living beings² is finished.

The section about the plant category, the second.

[c. The section about instruction]

[1. The commentary on the rule about instruction]

[21. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu, not agreed upon, should instruct bhikkhunīs, there is [an offence entailing expiation].*

(Pāt 52,8f. = Vin IV 51,3f.)]

In the first [rule] of the section about instruction, *not agreed upon* (asammato, Pāt 52,8) means: whatever formal agreement on a bhikkhu endowed with the eight qualities as an instructor of bhikkhunīs is prescribed by the Blessed One through a procedure [with a decision as] the

¹ Doubtful regarding whether it contains living creatures (*sappāñaka*), or whether it does not contain living creatures (*appāñaka*), see Vin IV 49,11f., 13f. (BD II 262).

² *sappāñaka-sikkhāpada*. For cross-references, the author of Kkh uses *siñcanasikkhāpada* (Kkh 212,21).

⟨167⟩*Suddhapācittiya 21 M*

333

[fourth [element] after [putting] the motion; ⟨167⟩ one not agreed upon by that.

Should instruct (ovadeyya, Pāt 52,8) means: should instruct a Bhikkhunī Saṅgha or many [bhikkhunīs] or a single bhikkhunī expounding by virtue of an instruction about the eight weighty rules beginning with c—“A bhikkhunī, [even one] ordained for a hundred years, must greet respectfully, rise from her seat, salute with cupped hands, [and] do proper homage to a bhikkhu, [even one] ordained that very day.”—c

[Offence entailing] expiation (pācittiyam, Pāt 52,9) means: there is an [offence entailing] expiation at the end of [his] instruction.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “instruction” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is [an offence of] wrong doing for one instructing about another matter¹ (*dhamma*) [than the eight weighty rules], or [instructing] one merely ordained among the bhikkhunīs.² Even for one agreed upon, if that procedure of formal agreement³ is an unlawful procedure,⁴ there are nine [offences entailing] expiation: for him, thinking it is an unlawful procedure when it is an unlawful procedure [and] instructing the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha when it is incomplete, there is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.⁵ Similarly, [there are triple offences entailing

c—cVin IV 255,6ff.

¹ Vin IV 52,5 (BD II 267). *Dhamma* here is not used in the sense of “rule” as it is in Pāt 8,2; 12,2, etc.; or in the sense of “offence” as in Kkh 28,9; 57,8; etc. According to Sp (IV 800,21f.) “another *dhamma*” comprises “another *suttanta*, or *abhidhamma*”; Kkh-nt 373,17f. explains it to mean whatever type of *dhamma* except the eight weighty rules.

² This refers to Vin IV 52,5f. (BD II 267).

³ *sammuti-kamma*; that is, the procedure with which he is made an instructor of bhikkhunīs.

⁴ *adhamma-kamma*; in that case the bhikkhu agreed upon as an instructor of bhikkhunīs by the Saṅgha with the prescribed procedure would actually not be agreed upon since the procedure is legally flawed.

⁵ The triple offence comes up for one thinking an unlawful procedure is an unlawful procedure and thinking that the incomplete Bhikkhunī Saṅgha is incomplete, or complete, or being in doubt (Vin IV 53,1–5, BD II 269f.).

334 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* **〈167〉**

expiation] for one who is in doubt and for one who thinks it is a lawful procedure [when it is an unlawful procedure].¹ Even when the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha is complete, [there are] nine [offences entailing expiation];² thus there are altogether] eighteen [offences entailing expiation] by virtue of an unlawful procedure.

But if it is a lawful procedure, ^d—“Thinking that it is a lawful procedure when it is a lawful procedure, he instructs the complete Bhikkhunī Saṅgha thinking it is complete”—^d leaving this last statement aside, in that way there are ^e—seventeen offences of wrong doing.^{3—e}

And it being said, “We are complete, sir” for one speaking about some other matter (*dhamma*), and it being said, “We are incomplete, sir”, for one speaking about the eight weighty rules, and for one speaking about some other matter not summing up the instruction⁴ there is only [an offence of] wrong doing (= 6. [sorts of] offence).⁵

^{d—d}Vin IV 53,30–33 ^{e—e}Sp IV 800,29

¹ A triple offence for one being in doubt about an unlawful procedure, depending on whether he thinks the incomplete Bhikkhunī Saṅgha to be incomplete or complete or whether he is in doubt (Vin IV 53,6ff.), and a triple offence for one thinking an unlawful procedure to be a lawful procedure, depending on whether he thinks the incomplete Bhikkhunī Saṅgha to be incomplete or complete or whether he is in doubt (Vin IV 53,9ff., BD II 270).

² There are three triads: (1) the procedure is considered unlawful when it is unlawful, and the complete Bhikkhunī Saṅgha is considered incomplete or complete, or the bhikkhu is in doubt as to its completeness (Vin IV 53,12ff.); (2) the bhikkhu is in doubt regarding the unlawful procedure, and the complete Bhikkhunī Saṅgha is considered incomplete or complete, or the bhikkhu is in doubt as to its completeness (Vin IV 53,15ff.); and (3) the procedure is considered lawful when it is unlawful, and the complete Bhikkhunī Saṅgha is considered incomplete or complete or the bhikkhu is in doubt as to its completeness (Vin IV 53,18ff.).

³ For details, see Appendix 30.

⁴ The regular proceeding is as follows (Vin IV 52,9–14, BD II 267): if bhikkhunīs come for instruction, they are asked whether they are complete; if they respond in the affirmative, they are asked whether the eight *garudhammas* are respected. If the bhikkhunīs confirm this, the bhikkhu sums up (*niyyādeti*): “This, sisters, is the instruction” (*eso bhaginiyo ovādo*, Vin IV 52,13f.). According to Kkh-nṭ, “not summing up the instruction means: not saying, ‘This, sisters, is the instruction.’” (Kkh-nṭ 374,5f.: *ovādañ ca aniyātētavā ti* (Kkh 167,20) *eso bhagini ovādo ti avatvā*).

⁵ These three cases are mentioned at Vin IV 52,35–38 (BD II 269).

But there is no offence for whoever instructs thinking it is a lawful procedure when it is a lawful procedure, [and] thinking that the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha is complete when it is complete;¹ [for whoever] gives a recitation of the text of the eight weighty rules;² gives an inquiry; expounds when spoken to with the words, “Explain, sir”; speaks when asked a question; speaks for the sake of another when the bhikkhunīs are listening; speaks to a trainee or a novice; and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) the fact of not being agreed upon, (ii) the fact of the complete ordination of the bhikkhunī, (iii) speaking about ⟨168⟩ the eight weighty rules by virtue of instruction (= 9. constituent factors).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are exactly the same as [for the rule] about the Doctrine word by word (Pāc 4 M).

The commentary on the rule about instruction is finished.

[2. The commentary on the rule about sunset]

[22. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu, even if agreed upon, should instruct bhikkhunīs when the sun has set, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 52,11f. = Vin IV 55,9f.)] [98]

In the second [rule]³ *Should instruct* (*ovadeyya*, Pāt 52,12) means: there is indeed [an offence entailing] expiation for one, even if agreed upon, who instructs about the eight weighty rules or some other matter.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Elder Cūlapanthaka (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “instructing when the sun has set” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

¹ Vin IV 53,32f. (BD II 271).

² This takes up Vin IV 53,34 (BD II 271): *anāpatti uddesam dento*; Sp IV 800,30f.: *uddesam dento ti aṭṭhanam garudhammānam pālim uddisanto*.

“**Giving a recitation** means: reciting the text of the eight weighty rules.”

³ For considerations regarding the splitting up of rules in order to reach 92 Pācittiyas, see von Hinüber 1999: 19.

336 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* 〈168〉

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking the sun has set when it has not² set, or who is in doubt, and for one instructing [a bhikkhunī] ordained on one side (i.e. by the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha) [only] (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

As in the previous rule there is no offence by way of recitation, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) the sun having set, (ii) there being the complete ordination [of the bhikkhunī], (iii) the instruction (= 9. constituent factors).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are exactly the same as for [the rule about] the Doctrine word by word (Pāc 4 M).

The commentary on the rule about sunset is finished.

[3. The commentary on the rule about bhikkhunīs' quarters]

[23. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu having gone to the bhikkhunīs' quarters should instruct bhikkhunīs, unless [it is] on the [proper] occasion, there is [an offence entailing] expiation. There, this is the [proper] occasion: a bhikkhunī is ill. This is the [proper] occasion here.*

(Pāt 52,14–17 = Vin IV 57,1–4)]

In the third [rule]³ *bhikkhunīs' quarters* (*bhikkhunupassayam*, Pāt 52,14) means: even a place for the dwelling⁴ of a bhikkhunī for a single night.

Should instruct (*ovadeyya*, Pāt 52,15): here there is [an offence entailing] expiation only for one instructing about the weighty rules.⁵ But if [the bhikkhu] is not agreed upon, there are two [offences entailing] expi-

¹ Vin IV 55,16ff. (BD II 275).

² Kkh 168,11 reads *sūriye atthaṅgate*, stating in n. 8 that C^e “inverts s.a.”. Actually, the editors of Kkh here follow B^e, though the offence, namely an offence of wrong doing, clearly indicates that *anatthaṅgate* has to be read here (see also Vin IV 55,19ff., BD II 275). C^e actually reads *anatthaṅgate suriye*. Kkh is to be corrected accordingly.

³ See above, p. 335, n. 3.

⁴ Kkh 168,21f. *vasan'-aṭṭhānam* should be corrected to *vasana-ṭṭhānam*. This is not a technical term for “dwelling place” but describes any place (*ṭṭhāna*) where one can dwell.

⁵ Vin IV 57,10f. (BD II 278).

ation.¹ But if he instructs even when the sun has set, there are three [offences entailing expiation].² But for one agreed upon, even instructing at night, there are only two. For there is no [offence entailing] expiation rooted in instruction about ⟨169⟩ the weighty rules for the bhikkhu, because of [his] being agreed upon.

[She] is ill (*gilānā*, Pāt 52,16) means: she is not able to go for instruction or for communal life (*samvāsa**).³

[This rule] was pronounced in the Sakka [country]⁴ (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “instructing, having gone to the bhikkhunīs’ quarters” (= 3. *subject matter*).

This, [i.e.] “unless [it is] on the [proper] occasion”, is the supplementary prescription (*anupaññatti*) here. [The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.⁵ It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking she is ordained when she is unordained or for one who is in doubt,⁶ and for one instructing one ordained on one side [only]⁷ with whatever [instruction], and another [bhikkhunī] (i.e. one ordained in both Sanghas) with some other teaching [than the eight weighty rules]⁸ (= 6. [sorts of] *offence*).

There is no offence [for one instructing] on the [proper] occasion, one [who is] unordained, and as in the previous rule by way of recitation, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the four constituent factors here: (i) going to [the bhikkhunīs’] quarters, (ii) the fact of being fully ordained, (iii) the absence of the [proper] occasion, (iv) the instruction about the weighty rules (= 9. *constituent factors*).

¹ From transgression of Pāc 21 and 23 M.

² From transgressions of Pāc 21, 22, and 23 M.

³ This literally accords with Vin IV 57,13f. (BD II 278).

⁴ *Sakkesu*; for this type of expression, see Pind 2008.

⁵ Vin IV 57,15–19 (BD II 278).

⁶ Vin IV 57,20ff. (BD II 278).

⁷ Vin IV 57,20 (BD II 278).

⁸ Vin IV 57,19 (BD II 278).

338 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨169⟩

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are the same as for the first *kaṭhina* [rule] (Niss 1 M),

but [the offence against] this [rule originates in] activity (= 11. activity).

The commentary on the rule about bhikkhunīs' quarters is finished.

[4. The commentary on the rule about material gain]

[24. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should say thus, “The bhikkhus [who are] elders are instructing bhikkhunīs for material gain”, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 52,19f. = Vin IV 58,10f.)]

In the fourth [rule] *For material gain* (āmisahetu, Pāt 52,19) means: for one or other among robes, etc.

Bhikkhus (*bhikkhū*, Pāt 52,19) means: bhikkhus agreed upon [as instructors for bhikkhunīs] are intended here.

[*Offence entailing*] expiation (*pācittiyam*, Pāt 52,20): there is [an offence entailing] expiation for one speaking thus because of [his] desire to denigrate such bhikkhus.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. provenance) concerning the group of six bhikkhus (= 2. individuals) with respect to the subject matter “Saying ‘They instruct for material gain’” (= 3. subject matter).

[The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. prescription).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. command).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation in the case of a lawful procedure.¹ There is a triple [offence of] wrong doing in the case of an unlawful procedure.² It is only an [offence of] wrong doing for one speaking thus to someone ordained who is not agreed upon [as an instructor], and to one who is unordained, whether agreed upon or not agreed upon. There, whoever, having received a formal agreement [as

¹ Vin IV 58,20–23 (BD II 280).

² This statement in Kkh is corroborated by Vin B^e C^e S^e which have *adhamma-kamme adhammakkammasaññī, āpatti dukkataissa*. This is further confirmed by Kkh-nt 375,3 explaining that — similar to the three *dhamma-kamma* cases — there are three offences of wrong doing in the *adhamma-kamma* cases. Thus the reading of Vin E^e IV 58,30f. — there are no variants given — namely, *adhammakkamme adhammakkammasaññī anāpatti* — is wrong.

⟨170⟩*Suddhapācittiya 25 M*

339

[an instructor of bhikkhunīs] at the time of [his being] a bhikkhu,¹ being established in the status of a novice, this one [when] agreed upon [as an instructor]² namely is one who is unordained (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one speaking thus about one instructing ordinarily for the gain of robes, etc., [99] and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence). ⟨170⟩

These are the four constituent factors here: (i) being ordained, (ii) the fact of having received a formal agreement lawfully, (iii) not being something other than material gain (i.e. being material gain), (iv) the speaking thus because of desire to denigrate (= 9. constituent factors).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] taking what is not given (Pār 2 M),

but the [offence against this rule is done with an] unpleasant [type of] feeling only (= 17. *feeling*).

The commentary on the rule about material gain is finished.

[5. The commentary on the rule about giving robe material]

[25. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should give robe material to a bhikkhuni not related [to him], unless [it is] in exchange, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 52,22f. = Vin IV 60,9f.)]

Regarding the fifth [rule], it was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning a certain bhikkhu (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “giving robe material” (= 3. *subject matter*).

But the remainder of the account is to be understood here exactly in the manner stated in the rule about formally accepting robe material (Niss 5 M). f—But (*hi*) there a bhikkhu was the one who formally accepts,

f—Sp IV 804,22ff.

¹ Kkh 169,25 read *bhikkhukāle* for *bhikkhu kāle*.

² The fact that the Vinaya lists cases of an ordained and unordained person, either agreed upon or not agreed upon, forces the commentators to explain how someone unordained could have been agreed upon by the Saṅgha as an instructor of bhikkhunīs. For a discussion of this, see Kieffer-Pülz 2010: 177f.; 2013: II [Z 209].

340 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨170⟩

here it is a bhikkhunī; this is the difference. The remainder is exactly the same.^f

The commentary on the rule about giving robe material is finished.

[6. The commentary on the rule about sewing robe material]

[26. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should sew a robe or have it sewn for a bhikkhunī not related [to him], there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 54,2f. = Vin IV 61,31f.)]

In the sixth [rule] robe (*cīvaraṁ*, Pāt 54,2) means: something fit for an inner garment (*nivāsana*) and an outer garment (*pārupana*).

Should sew or have it sewn (*sibbeyya vā sibbāpeyya*, Pāt 54,3): here it is [an offence entailing] expiation for one sewing himself, ^g—in taking out the needle having caused it to enter again and again.^g—^h—There is only a single [offence entailing] expiation for one taking it out once, although having penetrated one hundred times.^h But when he has been told, “Sew”, even if he finishes the whole work of sewing, there is only a single [offence entailing] expiation for the one giving the order. But if he finishes it, when spoken to with the words, “Whatever is to be done to the robe here, ⁱ—all that is your responsibility”,ⁱ—^j—there is [an offence entailing] expiation [for him]¹ in each insertion of the awl.² For the one giving the order there are indeed many [offences] because of one utterance,³ but in respect of a repeated order there is indeed nothing to be said.^j

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Elder Udāyi (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “sewing a robe” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

^g—^g Sp IV 805,3f.

^h—^h ≠ Sp IV 805,5f.

ⁱ—ⁱ Sp IV 805,9

^j—^j ≠ Sp IV 805,10ff.

¹ Sp IV 805,10 adds *āṇattassa* “for the one ordered”.

² Vin IV 62,1f. (BD II 287).

³ There is no basis in the Vinaya for this statement. And this statement, which is paralleled in Sp, is not commented upon in any of the commentaries.

⟨171⟩*Suddhapācittiya 27 M*

341

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking it is not a relative when it is a relative, or for one who is in doubt, and for sewing for one ordained on one side (i.e. in the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha) [only]² (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one sewing another requisite such as a bag; for one sewing, even a robe, for a relative; ⟨171⟩ and for trainees or female novices; and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) being the property of an unrelated bhikkhunī, (ii) being fit for an inner garment (*nivāsana*) and an outer garment (*pārupana*), (iii) sewing or having sewn with the stated characteristics (= 9. constituent factors).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are exactly the same as [for the rule] about a go-between (Sgh 5 M).

The commentary on the rule about sewing robe material is finished.

[7. The commentary on the rule about arrangements]

[27. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should by arrangement set out on the same road for journeying together with a bhikkhunī, even to another village, unless [it is] on the [proper] occasion, there is [an offence entailing] expiation. There, this is the [proper] occasion: the road, [which is] agreed to be dangerous [and] frightening, is to be gone along by a caravan. This is the [proper] occasion here.*

(Pāt 54.5–9 = Vin IV 63,17–21)]

In the seventh [rule], ^k–*by arrangement* (*samvidhāya*, Pāt 54.5) means: having arranged (alternative verb form); the meaning is: having made an appointment about the time of going.^k

On the same road for journeying (*ekaddhānamaggam*, Pāt 54.5f.) means: on the same road counted [as a way] for journeying; alternatively, on a road for journeying together.

[The road] is to be gone along by a caravan (*satthagāminīyo*, Pāt 54.7f.) means: it is to be gone along together with a caravan. The remainder of the meaning of the words is entirely clear.

^k–^kSp IV 806,1f.

¹ Vin IV 62,4ff. (BD II 287).

² Vin IV 62,6–9 (BD II 287).

But this is the regulation here: There is firstly [an offence of] wrong doing for one arranging on an unlawful site because of the arranging. There, except for the bhikkhunīs' quarters, a monastery (*ārāma*^{*}) within [a settlement],¹ a sitting hall, and the sleeping place of members of other sects,² the rest is an unlawful site.³ The meaning is: for one arranging while standing there. But for one who goes with a bhikkhunī, having [it] arranged — not having made a flawed appointment⁴ concerning a specified time [with the words], “Today or tomorrow”,⁵ even if having made a flawed appointment concerning a door or a flawed appointment concerning a road⁶ — as long as he does not enter⁷ the precinct [100] of another village, even a nearby one, fixed by men [with the words,] “This

¹ *antarārāma*; Sp IV 857,18f. and Kkh-nt 399,14f. [both ad Pāc 46 M]: *ettha antarārāman ti antogāme vihāro*. Bhikkhus' monasteries are usually outside of settlements, which may be the reason why the ground of a bhikkhus' monastery is considered unlawful ground for bhikkhunīs. On the other hand, a monastery (*ārāma*^{*}) within a settlement is considered lawful ground for bhikkhunīs. Since the bhikkhunīs' quarters are never designated as *ārāma*, we should assume that the *ārāmas* within settlements belonged to the bhikkhus' community. Whether *ārāma* in this instance is the pleasure ground, and not a monastery, remains unclear.

² Cf. Sp IV 806,19ff.: *sañvidhānakāle hi sace ubho pi bhikkhunī-upassaye vā antarārāme vā āsanasālāya vā titthiyaseyyāya vā thatvā sañvidahanti anāpatti*. “For if at the time of arranging they arrange [it] both staying in the bhikkhunīs' quarters, in a monastery within [a settlement], in the sitting hall, or in the sleeping place of members of other sects, there is no offence.”

³ Kkh-nt 376,8f. mentions as an unlawful site (*akappiyabhūmi*) the interior of a village (*antogāme*), the door of the bhikkhunīs' quarters, a road (*rathikā*), crossings (*catukka*), triangular places (*siṅghāṭaka*), elephants' stables (*hatthisālā*), etc.

⁴ *visāñketa*, a flawed appointment (for details, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I [Z 90]). See also Kkh-nt 376,23ff. with examples, among which “Or [saying] ‘Let us go today’ they go tomorrow” (“*ajja vā gamissāmā*” *ti sve gacchanti*”, Kkh-nt 376,24).

⁵ Such a flawed appointment normally leads to a non-offence (Sp IV 807,24–27).

⁶ A flawed appointment concerning the door or the road normally leads to an offence (Sp IV 807,27f.).

⁷ *okkamati* “to enter”; this verb is deliberately used in several rules in contrast to the verb *atikkamati* “to go beyond”; *okkamati* is normally used if one enters an area, *atikkamati* if one transgresses a boundary. For details, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 278] [3].

⟨172⟩*Suddhapācittiya 27 M*

343

| is the precinct of that”, so far there is no offence. But for him entering
| that [precinct], there is [an offence of] wrong doing in the first footstep,
| [an offence entailing] expiation in the second footstep; [thus, there are
| offences entailing] expiation in accordance with the number of [foot-
| steps while] entering the precinct of the village. But in respect of going
| beyond half a league (*yojana**), when there is no village, there is [an
| offence entailing] expiation in accordance with the number of half
| leagues (*yojana**). ⟨172⟩

| [This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the
| group of six bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject
| matter “setting out on the same road for journeying together” (= 3. *sub-
| ject matter*).

| This, [i.e.] “unless [it is] on the [proper] occasion” (*aññatra samaya*,
| Pāt 54.7), is the supplementary prescription (*anupaññatti*) here. [The
| rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

| It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

| There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ It is [an offence of]
| wrong doing for one thinking there is an arrangement when there is no
| arrangement; or for one who is in doubt;² and for one who has arranged
| it all solely by himself without a bhikkhunī arranging [it]³ (= 6. [sorts
| of] offence).

| There is no offence for one going on the [proper] occasion, even
| having arranged it, for one not arranging [it] himself, or for one [going]
| with a flawed appointment, or in disasters, and for one who is insane,
| etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

| These are the five constituent factors here: (i) both of them setting
| out on a road, having made an arrangement, (ii) the fact of there not
| being a flawed appointment, (iii) the absence of a [proper] occasion,
| (iv) the absence of disaster, (v) entering another village or going beyond
| half a league (*yojana**) (= 9. *constituent factors*).

¹ Vin IV 64.3–6 (BD II 291).

² Vin IV 64.7ff. (BD II 291).

³ Vin IV 64.6f. (BD II 291).

But together with those ordained on one side [only] (i.e. into the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha), the offence [arises] according to the rule about women (Pāc 67 M).¹

The [offence against this rule has the] origin of journeying (= 10. [sorts of] origin),²

- [it originates in] activity (= 11. *activity*),
- [has] no acquittal due to [lacking] awareness (= 12. *awareness*),
- [is] not [dependent on] intention (= 13. *intention*),
- [is] a fault according to a precept [laid down by the Buddha] (= 14. *fault*),
- [is] a physical deed, a verbal deed (= 15. *deeds*),
- [is done with] three [types of] thought (= 16. *thoughts*),
- [with] three [types of] feeling (= 17. *feelings*).

The commentary on the rule about arrangements is finished.

[8. The commentary on the rule about embarking on a boat]

[28. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should by arrangement embark together with a bhikkhunī on a boat going upstream or downstream, unless [it is] for crossing over [a body of water], there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 54,11 = Vin IV 65,18)]

¹ The insertion of this sentence was considered necessary to show that females who had only been ordained by the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha, that is, without having been ordained by the Bhikkhu Saṅgha thereafter, are not considered full-fledged bhikkhunīs, and arrangements with them are, therefore, dealt with according to the second “*saṃvidhāna* rule” (Pāc 68 M) regulating agreements with women (*mātugāma*) in general. Pāc 68 M, for sake of clarity, is here referred to by the name *mātu-gāma-sikkhāpada* (Kkh 172,11), though it, as the present one, normally is simply named *saṃvidhāna-sikkhāpada* (Pāt 68,23; Vjb 333,18; 334,3; Kkh-nt 410,7,12, Pāc-y 111,5; Sp-ṭ and Vmv only state that nothing is to be said regarding the seventh rule. Kkh-nt 377,if. explains that *mātu-gāma-sikkhāpada* refers to the seventh rule in the *sappāṇaka-vagga*, that is, the sixth *vagga*.

² Here the author gives the keyword for the arising (*saṃuṭṭhāna*) of the offence represented for the first time by Pāc 27 M, and thus named after this rule. This arising has four origins, by body; body and speech; body and thought; and by body, speech, and thought; for details see von Hintüber 1992a: 59 [2009: 148].

⟨173⟩*Suddhapācittiya 29 M*

345

In the eighth [rule], by arrangement (*samvidhāya*, Pāt 54,11) means:

^a—having arranged as one devoted to amusing [himself];^a the meaning is: having made an appointment in respect of the time of embarking.

Going upstream (*uddhangāminīm*, Pāt 54,12) means: ^b—going upwards against the current of the river^b by way of amusing [himself].

^c—*Going downstream* (*adhogāminīm*, Pāt 54,12) means: going down with the current in the same way.^c But whoever they carry, up or down, in order to set down at a ford[ing place], in that connection, there is no offence.

Unless [it is] ^d—for crossing over (*aññatra tiriyatarañāya*, Pāt 54,13): is the ablative case in the sense of the accusative case.^d The meaning is: Whatever crossing over, except for that.

[Offence entailing] expiation (*pācittiyam*, Pāt 54,13): there is [an offence entailing] expiation in accordance with the number of other villages at the time of going along the side of the bank that has villages; ⟨173⟩ or in accordance with the number of half leagues (*yojana**) at the time of going along the side of the bank that has no villages, or in the middle of the river which is a league in width. But in the sea it is suitable to go as one pleases.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. provenance) concerning the group of six bhikkhus (= 2. individuals) with respect to the subject matter “embarking on a boat” (= 3. subject matter).

This, [i.e.] “unless [it is] for crossing over” (*aññatra tiriyatarañāya*, Pāt 54,13), is the supplementary prescription (*anupaññatti*) here (= 4. prescription).

The remainder is to be understood exactly in the manner stated in the immediately preceding rule (Pāc 27 M).

The commentary on the rule about embarking on a boat is finished.

[9. The commentary on the rule about prepared]

[29. Pāc M: If any bhikkhu should knowingly eat almsfood prepared through [the agency of] a bhikkhunī, unless [it is] by a prior arrangement with householders, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.

(Pāt 54,15f. = Vin IV 67,19)]

^a—^a≠Sp IV 808,2 ^b—^bSp IV 808,3 ^c—^c≠Sp IV 808,6f. ^d—^dSp IV 808,11f.

In the ninth [rule], ^e-prepared through [the agency of] a bhikkhunī (*bhikkhunīparipācitaṁ*, Pāt 54,15) means: prepared through [the agency of] a bhikkhunī (resolution of compound).^e The meaning is: procuring [something], making [something fit] to be received thus, “Give to the noble one; make for the noble one”, after having made known that bhikkhu’s virtue in the presence of householders who are not related to him or to herself or [who have not] invited [him or her].¹

^f-[Unless] [it is] by a prior arrangement with householders (*pubbe gihisamārambhā*, Pāt 54,16): here “arrangement” means: it has been arranged, this is a word for prepared; “arrangement with householders” (*gihī-samārambho*) [101] [means] an arrangement of householders (resolution of compound); the meaning is: whatever food has been prepared by householders for bhikkhus prior to (*pubbe*, Pāt 54,16), [that is] earlier than,² the preparation [through the agency] of the bhikkhunī,^f or [whatever] is the property of relations and those who have invited,^g-except for that; for one knowingly eating other [food than this], there is [an offence entailing] expiation.^g And that is in accordance with the number of swallows; but in formally accepting there is [an offence of] wrong doing for him.

[This rule] was prescribed at Rājagaha (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Devadatta (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “eating alms-food prepared through [the agency of] a bhikkhunī” (= 3. *subject matter*).

This, [i.e.] “unless [it is] by a prior arrangement with householders” (*aññatra pubbe gihisamārambhā*, Pāt 54,16), is the supplementary prescription (*anupaññatti*) here. [The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

^e-eSp IV 809,2 ^f-f≠ Sp IV 809,6-10 ^g-g≠ Sp IV 809,11f.

¹ *ñātaka-pavāritānam*; for a discussion of this compound in the Vinaya, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 248], n. 16. Deviating from the cases in the Vinaya, where *ñātaka-pavārita* refers to bhikkhus “who are related or invited”, the compound here is linked to *gihīnam*. This is unproblematic with respect to *ñātaka*, but forces us to translate *pavārita*, as “having invited” (instead of “being invited”). See also below, p. 398, n. 2.

² The *pubbe* is quoted from the rule, the *pathamataram yeva* is its explanation as shown by the parallel: Sp IV 809,6f.; *pubbe gihīsamārambhā ti eththa pubbe ti pathamam*.

⟨174⟩

Suddhapācittiya 29 M

347

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is [an offence of] wrong doing for one eating [food] prepared through [the agency of] one ordained on one side [only] (namely, into the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha),¹ for one thinking it was prepared when it was not prepared,² and for one who is in doubt in both cases³ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one thinking it was not prepared in both cases,⁴ in the event of a [prior] arrangement with householders,⁵ in respect of [food] prepared by trainees and female novices, ⟨174⟩ except for the five foods (*bhojana*) in respect of the rest, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

These are the five constituent factors here: (i) being prepared through [the agency of] a bhikkhunī, (ii) knowledge of the state of being prepared, (iii) absence of a [prior] arrangement with householders, (iv) being something other than cooked grain,⁶ etc.,⁷ (v) swallowing it (= 9. constituent factors).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are the same as for the first [rule entailing] defeat (Pār 1 M),

but [the offence against] this [rule is] a fault according to a precept [laid down by the Buddha] (= 14. *fault*),

[is done with] three [types of] thought (= 16. *thoughts*),

[with] three [types of] feeling (= 17. *feelings*).

The commentary on the rule about prepared is finished.

¹ Vin IV 68,4f. (BD II 298).

² Vin IV 68,5f. (BD II 298).

³ That is, being in doubt about when it is prepared and when it is not prepared, Vin IV 68,2f., 6f. (BD II 298).

⁴ That is, he thinks it is not prepared when it is prepared (Vin IV 68,3f., BD II 298) and when it is not prepared (Vin IV 68,7, BD II 298).

⁵ *gihī-samārambhe*; Vin IV 68,9 *pubbe gihī-samārambhe*.

⁶ *odana*; this term comprises the seven types of grain (*dhañña*), namely *sāli*, *vīhi*, *yavo*, *godhumo*, *kañgu*, *varako*, *kudrūso*, or *kudrūsako*. For a gruel to be an *odana*, a specific consistency is required; it must be firm when cooled. When it remains liquid it is called *yāgu*. For more details, see Kieffer-Püllz 2013: II [Z 219].

⁷ These are the five types of soft food (*bhojana*), namely “gruel” (*odana*), “food made with flour” (*kummāsa*), “barley-meal” (*sattu*), “fish” (*maccha*), “meat” (*mamsa*; Vin IV 83,3f., BD II 330).

348

Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation

⟨175⟩

[10. The commentary on the rule about sitting in secret]

[30. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should take a seat together with a bhikkhunī in secret, one man with one woman, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 54,19f. = Vin IV 68,28f.)]

In the tenth [rule] the whole account ^his to be understood exactly in the way stated in the second indefinite rule (see above, p. 185). For the present rule forms a single division with the second indefinite rule and the fourth rule of Upananda below (Pāc 44 M), but it is pronounced separately by virtue of the introductory story (lit. “the arising of the matter”).^h

The commentary on the rule about sitting in secret is finished.

The section about instruction, the third.

[d. The section about food]

[1. The commentary on the rule about meals in public rest houses]

[31. Pāc M: *One meal in a public rest house may be eaten by a bhikkhu who is not ill. If he should eat more than that, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 56,3f. = Vin IV 70,33f.)]

In the first [rule] of the section about food by *one who is not ill* (*agilānena*, Pāt 56,3) means: by one able to go even half a league (*yojana**).

One (*eko*, Pāt 56,3) means: pertaining to one day.

Meal in a public rest house (*āvasathapiṇḍo*, Pāt 56,3) means: food made ready by those desirous of merit here and there in halls, etc., without assigning [it, by specifying] ⁱ—the sect thus,¹ “For these or for so many”,ⁱ or [by specifying] the meal thus, “Only that much.”

It may be eaten (*bhuñjitabbo*, Pāt 56,3) means: prepared by one family or various families all together either in one ⟨175⟩ place or in

^{h-h}Sp IV 809,27-31 ⁱ⁻ⁱ≠ Sp IV 810,11f.

¹ Kkh 174,23 reads *ekam* with v.l. *evam*. In the light of the second part of this sentence and the parallel construction of both sentences *evam* is to be expected. The slightly deviating parallel in Sp IV 810,11, however, also reads *ekam*.

⟨175⟩

Suddhapācittiya 31 M

349

many places or in an undefined place thus [stated], “Today in one place, tomorrow in another place”, it may be *eaten* in one place in one day only.

If more than that (*tato ce uttari*, Pāt 56.4) means: starting from the next day in that place or another place there is [an offence of] wrong doing in formally accepting from their property. There is [an offence entailing] expiation with each swallow.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “eating food in a public rest house staying on [there]” (= 3. *subject matter*).

This, [i.e.] “by [a bhikkhu] who is not ill” (*agilānena*, Pāt 56.3), is the supplementary prescription (*anupaññatti*) here (i.e. in Pāc 31 M).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking he is not ill when he is ill, or for one who is in doubt² (= 6. *[sorts of] offence*).

It is not an offence for one thinking that he is ill when he is ill;³ and [it is not an offence for] whoever eats once,⁴ j—or [for] whoever [eats] going^j k—on the road for one day, [102] [eats] in the place he has gone to for one day;—^k a—[eats] also when he comes back on the road for one day, [and eats] in the place he has come to for one day;—^a b—and [there is no offence for] one who, having eaten [with the thought], “I will go”, goes forth;—^b c—having turned back because of some problem, [when] he knows [it] is safe, goes again for one day [and] eats.^{5—c} [And it is not an

j—j Sp IV 810,31 k—k ≠ Sp IV 810,32 a—a ≠ Sp IV 810,34f. b—b ≠ Sp IV 810,35—II,1
c—c ≠ Sp IV 811,1ff.

¹ Vin IV 71,7ff. (BD II 305).

² Vin IV 71,9f. (BD II 305).

³ Corresponds to Vin IV 71,12: *anāpatti gilānassa*, and Vin IV 71,10f. *gilāno gilānasāññī anāpatti*.

⁴ Corresponds to “There is no offence ... if one who is not ill eats once” (*anāpatti ... agilāno sakīm bhuñjati*, Vin IV 71,12).

⁵ This “eats” (*bhuñjati*) is valid for each of the previously mentioned cases as is made plain by the more detailed parallel in Sp. It, therefore, has been added accordingly. For the parallel in Sp, see Appendix 31.

350

Bhikkhupātimokkha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation

⟨175⟩

offence] for whoever the owners give [food] having invited him,¹ or to whoever² — among the bhikkhus indeed — prepared [food] has been assigned,³ [or if] not enough has been prepared,⁴ or — putting aside the five sorts of food — [if] one eats something else — for him, and [there is no offence] for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) the fact of a meal in a public rest house, (ii) not being ill, (iii) eating having stayed on (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [*sorts of*] *origin*), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] sheep's wool (Niss 16 M).

The commentary on the rule about meals in public rest houses is finished.

[2. The commentary on the rule about food [accepted] by a group]

[32. Pāc M: *In food [accepted] by a group*,⁵ unless [it is] on the [proper] occasion, there is [an offence entailing] expiation. There, this is the [proper] occasion: an occasion of illness, an occasion of giving robe material, an occasion of making robes, an occasion of going on a

¹ Vin IV 71,13: *sāmikā nimantetvā bhojenti*.

² Kkh 175,15 yo with B^e *yam* (n. 6). The *yo* cannot be construed in this sentence.

³ Vin IV 71,13f.: *odissa paññatto hoti*.

⁴ Vin IV 71,14: *na yāvadattho paññatto hoti*.

⁵ *gāna-bhojana*; the translations of this compound vary: “in eating [a meal] in a group” (Nyānatāsita 2014: 188); “in going in a body to receive a meal” (*VinTexts* I 38); “eating in groups” (Ñāṇamoli 1966: 52; Norman and Pruitt 2008: 57); “group-meal” (BD II 311; Thānissaro 2007: I 378). As the regulation provided in Kkh shows, it is irrelevant whether the bhikkhus are invited in a group or separately, whether they go to the place as a group or separately, and whether they eat the food in a group or separately. In order to speak of *gāna-bhojana* it is decisive that the monks accept the offer together (*ekato gāñhanti*, Kkh 176,6). Therefore, translations rendering *bhojana* as “eating” are not correct. The same holds true for Oldenberg’s and Rhys David’s “in going in a body to receive a meal”, since the “going in a body” is irrelevant for this rule too. “Group-meal” which is easily used in the translation does not reflect which part of the meal is carried through by a group. Following the interpretation of the commentary, we translate *gāna-bhojana* as “food [accepted] by a group”.

⟨176⟩*Suddhapācittiya 32 M*

351

journey, an occasion of embarking on a boat, a great gathering, an occasion of a recluses' meal. This is the [proper] occasion there.

(Pāt 56,6-9 = Vin IV 74,24-27])

In the second [rule] ^d-*in food [accepted]* by a group (*gaṇabhojane*, Pāt 56,6) means: in food of a group (resolution of compound). And here “group” (*gaṇa*) means four or more bhikkhus.^{-d} The meaning is: when a certain food of the five foods, beginning with cooked grain, ⟨176⟩ has been obtained (*laddha*) by them through an invitation or by asking.

There, this is the regulation: If indeed anyone ^e-having approached four bhikkhus; ^f-having named the five foods by some synonym or other or by some other language, ^f-invites them in the manner ^g-“I invite you with cooked grain, accept my cooked grain”, ^g-etc., if they, thus invited either together or separately, having gone either together or separately, accept it together (*ekato gaṇhanti*), afterwards eat it either together or separately, it becomes food [accepted] by a group. For in this context only formally accepting (*patigahana*) is the measure.

If having named cooked grain, etc., having asked and gone — either together or separately — they accept it together (*ekato gaṇhanti*), thus too it is food [accepted] by a group indeed. There is [an offence of] wrong doing in thus formally accepting this [food] of two sorts.¹ There is [an offence entailing] expiation with each swallow.

With reference to occasions of illness, etc., when he is unable to wander for alms even because [the soles of his] feet have split open,² this is *an occasion of illness* (*gilānasamayo*, Pāt 56,7).

^{d-d} Sp IV 812,3ff. ^{e-e} Sp IV 812,9f. ^{f-f} Sp IV 812,12f. ^{g-g} Sp IV 812,10f.

¹ This refers to the food obtained either by invitation or by asking, Kkh-nt 380,5ff.

² In a culture where it is usual to walk barefoot or with open shoes, split soles of the feet is certainly quite common. This is why the commentator declares that even having feet [the soles of which] are split open counts as an occasion of illness. Cf. Kkh-nt 381,9f.: *pādānam pi phalitattā ti* (Kkh 176,11f.) *antamaso pādānam pi yathā mahācammassa parato maṇṣam dissati, evam phalitattā.*

“Even because [the soles of his] feet have split open means: even because [the soles of his] feet have split open in such a way that the flesh beneath the external (?) skin is visible.”

[For those for whom] the *kathina* has been spread out for five months; for the others,¹ the month of Kattika; this is the *occasion of giving robe material* (*cīvaradānasamayo*, Pāt 56,7).

When whoever does whatever work is to be done in respect of a robe, while the robe is being made, this is the *occasion of making robes* (*cīvarakārasamayo*, Pāt 56,7f.).

When someone is wishing to go, or is going, or has gone even half a league (*yojana**), this is the *occasion of going on a journey* (*addhānagamanasamayo*, Pāt 56,8).

Even with respect to the *occasion of embarking on a boat* (*nāvābhiruhanasamayo*, Pāt 56,8) exactly this is the method.

When four bhikkhus, having wandered for alms in their begging-round village, do not make a living, this is a great gathering (or, an occasion of a great [scarcity])² (*mahāsamayo*, Pāt 56,9).

When anyone who has gone forth invites with a meal, this is the *occasion of a recluses' meal*³ (*samaṇabhattasamayo*, Pāt 56,9). It is suitable to eat on these occasions.

[This rule] was prescribed at Rājagaha (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Devadatta (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “eating after having asked” (= 3. *subject matter*).

This, [i.e.] “unless [it is] on the [proper] occasion” (*aññatratrā samayā*, Pāt 56,6) is the sevenfold supplementary prescription (*anupaññatti*) here. [The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.⁴ It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking there is food [accepted] by a group when

¹ That is, for those who did not spread out the *kathina*. For them there is only a single month of giving requisites, namely, the last month of the rains residence, whereas those who spread out *kathina*, and thereby open the *kathina* period, prolong this time period up to five months, see above, p. 272.

² *mahā-samaya*, stands for Skt *mahā-samāja* “great gathering”. The Word Analysis of the Vinaya as well as Kkh here understand it as “an occasion of great [scarcity]; for details see Appendix 32.

³ Kkh 176,20 *samanabhattasamayo* has to be put into italics.

⁴ Vin IV 75,13ff. (BD II 312).

⟨177⟩

Suddhapācittiya 33 M

353

there is no food [accepted] by a group, or for one who is in doubt¹ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

But there is no offence for one who does not think there is food [accepted] by a group [when there is no food accepted by a group];² and [there is no offence] for those who, being two or three, receive [food] together;³ for many⁴ [103] eating [food] together having wandered for alms; in the case of permanent meals, etc.;⁵ under all circumstances (i.e. with every type of food) apart from the five sorts of food;⁶ and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence). ⟨177⟩

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) being food [accepted] by a group, (ii) the absence of an occasion, (iii) swallowing (= 9. constituent factors).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are exactly the same as for [the rule about] sheep's wool (Niss 16 M).

The commentary on the rule about food
[accepted] by a group is finished.

[3. The commentary on the rule about food in [irregular] sequence]
[33. Pāc M: In food in [irregular] sequence,⁷ unless [it is] on the [proper]

¹ Vin IV 75,15ff (BD II 312f).

² Vin IV 75,17f. *anāpatti* ... *dve tayo ekato bhūñjanti*. “There is no offence ... if two, three eat together.” Sp IV 813,29ff: *dve tayo ekato ti ye pi akappiyā nimantanam sādiyitvā dve tayo vā ekato gahetvā bhūñjanti tesam pi anāpatti*. “**Two, three together** means: if two or three, even if having accepted an unlawful invitation, having accepted [it] together, eat [it], even for them there is no offence.”

³ Two or three do not constitute a *gāṇa*.

⁴ Since in the present case there is no restriction as to the number of persons (see Vin IV 75,19f.: *piṇḍāya caritvā ekato sannipatitvā bhūñjanti*) but in the preceding case there was a restriction of up to three persons, the commentator obviously considered it necessary to add the *bahūnām* here.

⁵ The “etc.” refers to *salākabhattam* “ticket food”, *pakkhikam* “[food given on one day of a] half month”, *uposathikam* “[food given on] an observance day”, *pātipadikam* “[food given on] the first day of a half month” (Vin IV 75,20f.).

⁶ If the five types of food (*bhojana*) are excluded there arises no offence anywhere, since this rule only refers to the five types of *bhojana*.

⁷ *param-para-bhōjana*; suggested translations: “in taking food in turn” (VinTexts I 38); “an out-of-turn meal” (BD II 319; Thānissaro 2007: 385); “in substituting a meal (for another meal for which an invitation has already been accepted earlier)” (Ñāṇamoli 1966: 54); “in meals in succession” (Norman and Pruitt 2008: 57); “in [taking] a meal before another [invitation-meal]” (Ñāṇasita 2014: 190).

354 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* 〈177〉

occasion, there is [an offence entailing] expiation. There, this is the [proper] occasion: an occasion of illness, an occasion of giving robe material, an occasion of making robes. This is the [proper] occasion there.

(Pāt 56,12–14 = Vin IV 77,30ff.)

In the third [rule], *in food in [irregular] sequence (paramparabhojane, Pāt 56,12)* means: for one invited with the five foods in exactly the manner stated in [the rule about] food [accepted] by a group (Pāc 32 M), by whomever he was first invited, either out of regular order from this one's food or not having assigned [it],¹ in [eating] food of this or that other person.

Therefore, if any bhikkhu swallows even one mouthful from the food obtained in the family who invited him later without assigning the first invitation to anyone among the five co-religionists, either face-to-face, thus, “To you I give my expectation of food” or “I assign”, or in absence, thus, “I give to such-and-such a one” or “I assign”, it is [an offence entailing] expiation. The [proper] occasions are exactly of the sort stated.

[This rule] was prescribed at Vesāli (= 1. *provenance*) concerning many bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “food [one] is invited to [receive] elsewhere” (= 3. *subject matter*).

This, [i.e.] “unless [it is] on the [proper] occasion” (*aññatratra samayā*, Pāt 56,12), is a triple supplementary prescription (*anupaññatti*) here. But in the Parivāra, including also the assignment, it is said h—“four supplementary rules”²—h [The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation. It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking it is food in [irregular] sequence when it is not food in [irregular] sequence, or for one who is in doubt (= 6. [sorts of] *offence*).

h—hVin V 18,20

¹ If one is not able to take food that is offered, one has to assign it (*vikappeti*) to someone else.

² The reference in Kkh 177 n.* to “86,20” should be corrected to “18,20”. Vin E^e and S^e read *tisso*, B^e reads *catasso*. The author of Kkh had before him a manuscript reading *catasso*.

But there is no offence for one who thinks it is not food in [irregular] sequence [when it is not food in irregular sequence], and for him who eats on the [proper] occasion, or after having assigned [the food], or [who eats food] mixed into one after having put two [or] three invitations together,¹ [or who] eats in the regular order of the invitations, [or who] — invited by a whole village or guild — eats here and there among them, or, being invited says, “I will accept alms”; [and there is no offence] in respect of permanent meals, etc., [and] under all circumstances (i.e. with every type of food) apart from the five sorts of food, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*). ⟨178⟩

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) being food in [irregular] sequence, (ii) the absence of an occasion, (iii) swallowing (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [*sorts of*] *origin*), etc., are exactly the same as for the first *kathina* [rule] (Niss 1 M),

but [the offence against] this [rule originates in] activity and inactivity (= 11. *activity*).²

The commentary on the rule about food
in [irregular] sequence is finished.

¹ Kkh 177,23: *ekasamsatthāni vā dve tīṇi nimantanāni ekato vā katvā bhuñjati*. The *vā* ... *vā* construction suggests that there are two elements. Vin IV 78,23f., however, has only one element (*dve tayo nimantane ekato bhuñjati*). Kkh-nṭ 382,16ff. explains *eka-saṃsaṭṭhāni*, but the explanation the commentator gives is borrowed from Sp IV 817,20f., where this explanation is given to *dve tayo nimantane ekato bhuñjati*. Therefore, it is to be assumed that *eka-saṃsaṭṭhāni* refers to the meals joined into one by combining several invitations. This then forms the direct object to *bhuñjati*. This, however, implies, that the *vā* between *ekato* and *katvā* is superfluous. Kkh-nṭ 382,16–19: *ekasamṣatthānī ti ekasmiṇū missitāni. idam vuttam hoti: “dve tīṇi kulāni nimantetvā ekasmiṇū thāne nisṭāpetvā ito c’ ito ca āharityā bhattam ākiranti, sūpabyañjanam ākiranti, ekamissakanū hoti, ettha anāpatti” ti* (Sp IV 817,22–25 = quotation from Mahāpaccarī). “[Meals] joined together means: mixed into one. The following is said [by this], ‘[If] two [or] three families, having invited, cause [the invited] to sit in one single place, and having brought [food] from here and there they fill [in] the food, fill in curry and vegetables, it becomes one mixed [meal]; here there is no offence.’” For the rules that apply in the case of mixed food, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 219], [Z 222].

356

Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation

⟨178⟩

[4. The commentary on the rule about Kāṇa's mother]

[34. Pāc M: *Should a family bring and invite with cakes or biscuits a bhikkhu who has arrived, two or three bowlfuls are to be formally accepted by the bhikkhu if he wishes. If he should formally accept more than that, there is [an offence entailing] expiation. Having formally accepted two or three bowlfuls, having brought them back from there, they are to be shared with the bhikkhus. This is the proper course there.*

(Pāt 56,16–21 = Vin IV 80,16–21)]

In the fourth [rule] with *cakes* (*pūvehi*, Pāt 56,16) means: with various sorts of solid food, ⁱ—very tasty sweets and cakes, etc., ^{–i} prepared for the sake of a present.

With biscuits (*manthehi*, Pāt 56,16) means: with various sorts of ^j—flour, sesame, rice, etc., ^{–j} prepared as provisions for a journey.

^k—*Two or three bowlfuls* (*dvattipattapūrā*, Pāt 56,18) means: ^{–k} two or three bowlfuls (*resolution of compound*), not going past ^k—the lowest line on the rim of the bowl. ^{–k}

^a—*If more than that* (*tato ce uttari*, Pāt 56,18) means: even if he accepts a third bowl made into a heap, ^{–a} there is [an offence entailing] expiation in accordance with the number of cakes rising above the lowest line on the rim of the bowl.

Having formally accepted two or three bowlfuls (*dvattipattapūre patiggahetvā*, Pāt 56,18) means: here, whoever has accepted two [bowlfuls], if he sees a bhikkhu outside, he should say [to him], ^b—“Two bowlfuls were accepted by me here. You should accept [only] one.” And if this [other bhikkhu] also sees another [bhikkhu], he should say [to him], “Two bowlfuls were accepted by the one who came first. One was accepted by me. Don’t you accept [anything there].” By whoever one [bowl] was accepted first, [104] for him, too, exactly this method [applies] to announcing the succession [of handing over]. But whoever accepted three [bowlfuls] himself, if he sees another [bhikkhu], he should say, “Don’t formally accept anything here.” ^{–b} There is [an offence

^{i–i} Sp IV 819,34f. ^{j–j} ≠ Sp IV 820,2f. ^{k–k} ≠ Sp IV 820,5f. ^{a–a} Sp IV 820,4
^{b–b} ≠ Sp IV 820,8–13

⟨179⟩*Suddhapācittiya 34 M*

357

[of] wrong doing for him in not saying [this]. There is indeed [an offence of] wrong doing for the one who, having heard, even so accepts [it].¹

Having brought them back from there, they are to be shared with the bhikkhus (tato nīharityā bhikkhūhi saddhim sañvibhajitabbam, Pāt 56,19f.) means: whatever sitting hall, or dwelling place, or wherever he ⟨179⟩ goes constantly, is nearest of all to the place [where the food] was obtained, having gone there, having placed aside one bowlful for himself, the rest is to be given to the Bhikkhu Saṅgha. But it is not fitting to give in accordance with friendship. c-[As for] whoever accepted one [bowlful], nothing is to be given by him against his will. It must be done as he wishes.^c

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning many bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “formally accepting not knowing the limit” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.² It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking there are more when there are less than two or three bowlfuls, or for one who is in doubt (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

But there is no offence for one who thinks there are less [when there are less than two or three bowlfuls, if] it is prepared neither as a present nor as provisions for a journey, or [if] it is the remainder of what was prepared for that purpose, or if the journey is given up, or if relatives and those who have invited are giving,³ for one accepting by means of his own resources, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

^c-cSp IV 820,24f.

¹ This regulation is not commented on in the commentary, and seems to be absent from Sp.

² For the casuistry of this rule Vin IV 78,20 refers to Pāc 32 (Vin IV 75,13ff.).

³ Compare Sp IV 820,28f.: *ñātakānañ pavāritānan ti* (Vin IV 81,12f.) *etesañ bahum pi dentānañ patīgañhantassa anāpatti*. “**From relatives, from those having invited**, means: there is no offence for one formally accepting from them [even when] they give a large quantity.”

358

Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation

⟨179⟩

These are the five constituent factors here: (i) being cakes and biscuits with the stated characteristics, (ii) not being left over, (iii) a journey not having been given up, (iv) not being relatives,¹ etc.,² (v) formally accepting more (= 9. constituent factors).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are exactly the same as for [the rule about] a go-between (Sgh 5 M).

The commentary on the rule about Kāṇa's mother is finished.

[5. The commentary on the first rule about invitations]

[35. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu who has eaten,³ has been invited [to eat more and has declined] should chew or partake of⁴ solid food or soft food that is not left over, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 58,2ff. = Vin IV 82,21ff.)]

In the fifth [rule]⁵ d—*has eaten* (*bhuttāvī*, Pāt 58,2) means: having eaten (alternative form).^{—d} By whom even a [piece] of the five foods the size of a mustard seed has been swallowed, he is so called (i.e. one that has eaten).

e—*Has been invited*^{—e} (*pavārito*, Pāt 58,2): the meaning is: e—he has been invited,⁶ [and] he has declined,^{7—e} by virtue of the five factors

d—d Sp IV 821,11 e—e Sp IV 821,14f.

¹ Kkh 179,13 *anaññātakādīta*, “the fact of not being strangers, etc.”; Kkh 179, n. 10, refers to C^e *aññātakādīta* “the fact of not being relatives, etc.”. The reading of C^e is correct here, since it is one of the premisses for transgressing this rule that those who give are not relatives. The text of Kkh 179,13 is to be corrected accordingly.

² “Etc.” refers to those who invited the bhikkhus.

³ To be understood in the sense of “has finished his meal”, see Kkh-nṭ 383,17: *bhuttava ti* (Kkh 179,19) *katabhuttakicco*. “One who has eaten means: one who has finished his meal”. See also Thānissaro 2007: I 393. For a discussion of the implications of the meaning of *bhuttāvin*, see Thānissaro 2007: I 392f.

⁴ *khādati* and *bhuñjati* both mean eat. They are used in relation to hard (*khādanīya*) and soft food (*bhojanīya*). In order to show the difference of the verbs used we render *khādati* by “chew” and *bhuñjati* by “partake of” in those rules where both words appear. Otherwise *bhuñjati* like *paribhuñjati* is rendered by “eat”.

⁵ For the relation of this rule with a passage in the Mahāvagga (Vin I 238,29–32), see von Hinüber 1999: 57.

⁶ Lit. “has an invitation made [to him]”.

⁷ Lit. “he has made a rejection [to eat more]”.

Page 407 job: 1272818

180 *Suddhapācittiya 35 M* 359

stated in the text (Vinaya) thus, (i) “eating is understood [to take place],¹ (ii) [additional] food is understood [to be available], (iii) [the donor] stands within arm’s reach (*hattha-pāsa**), (iv) [the donor] offers,² (v) rejection [of the additional food] is understood [to have taken place].”

— There, because [he is] one with [his] food unfinished [by means of the words], “eating is understood [to take place]”, he is said to be invited. And by him whose food is unfinished, some [of the food] is eaten, some is not eaten; **180** and what is eaten, with reference to that, he is called one [who] “has eaten” (*bhuttāvī*, Pāt 58,2).³ Therefore we do not see any separate clarification of the meaning by means of the word “has eaten” [in the Pātimokkha rule]; but it is to be understood that — like the phrase “two nights, etc.” (*dirattādi*) in such [phrases] as “two or three nights” (*dirattā-tirattam*) — the [word (i.e. *bhuttāvī*)] is said, because of [it] being an accompaniment to the word “invited” (*pavārito*) and because they are used together.^{4–f}

But among the factors of an invitation g–(i) “eating is understood [to take place]” (*āsanam paññāyati*, Kkh 179,21) means: unfinished food is seen; the meaning is: if⁵ one partakes of it, he is such an individual (i.e. who is still eating or whose food is unfinished).

(ii) “[Additional] food is understood [to be available]” (*bhajanam paññāyati*, Kkh 179,21) means: [Additional] food sufficient for an invitation is seen; the meaning is: if⁶ one or other of cooked grain, etc.,

f–f ≠ Sp IV 821,18–25 g–g ≠ Sp IV 821,25–22,2

¹ Understood as the condition that a bhikkhu still eats when further food is offered, see Thānissaro 2007: I 394.

² Vin IV 82,27f. (BD II 328f.). The elements three and four in the commentary seem to form a single element only in the Vinaya, namely “[the donor] standing within arm’s reach offers” (*hatthapāse thito abhiharati*, Vin IV 82,28). Cf. BD II 329, nn. 1, 2.

³ This interpretation implies that a bhikkhu would not be able to eat the rest of the food in his bowl if he declined an offer of further food, see also Thānissaro 2007: I 392.

⁴ Lit. “their sounds are joined”, which means they are effectively a single expression. (Suggestion by Alastair Gornall, email 2/3/2017).

⁵ “If” (*ce*) in the parallel in Sp IV 821,26. Since in all following definitions, the text in Kkh also reads *ce* (Kkh 180,8, 9, 11, 13), we should probably read *ce sa* here instead of *c’ esa* (Kkh 180,6).

⁶ Kkh 180,8 = Sp IV 821,28 *odanādīnañ ce* with v.l. *ca* for *ce* (Kkh 180 n. 9, reading of C^e). The parallel in Pālim B^e 124,4 also reads *ca*.

360 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨180⟩

becomes [additional] food that may be rejected.

(iii) “[The donor] stands within arm’s reach” (*hatthapāse thito*, Kkh 179,21): the meaning is: if the donor taking food sufficient for an invitation stands in a space at two-and-a-half cubits’ distance (*hattha*, ca. 1 m.).¹

(iv) “[The donor] offers” (*abhiharati*, Kkh 179,22): [105] the meaning is: if that donor physically brings that food to him.

(v) “Rejection [of additional food] is understood [to have taken place]” (*paṭikkhepo paññāyati*, Kkh 179,22) means: rejection [of additional food] is seen; the meaning is: a bhikkhu physically or verbally rejects [the food], when it is brought.

Thus, one is invited by virtue of [these] five factors.^{-g}

There, this is the regulation. ^h–(i) First, among “eating”, etc. (*āsanatī ādīsu*, Kkh 179,21), whatever he eats and whatever food he rejects brought by someone standing within arm’s reach (*hattha-pāsa**),^{–h} that is to be understood as one or other indeed of the following: (1) cooked grain (*odana*), (2) porridge (*kummāsa*), (3) flour (*sattu*), (4) fish (*maccha*), (5) meat (*māṃsa*).

There, (1) “cooked grain” (*odana*) means: rice (*sāli*), paddy-rice (*vīhi*), barley (*yava*), wheat (*godhuma*), millet (*kaṅgu*), beans (*varaka*), rye (*kudrūsaka*).² Taking kernals of these seven grains [thinking], “Let us cook a meal”, or “Let us cook gruel”,ⁱ let them cook with reference to this or that. If at the time of eating, in the places where they receive it, a solid limit (*odhi*)³ is perceived [in the food, then] it is cooked grain, it constitutes an invitation for those partaking of [it], hot or cold.^{–i} ^j–But whatever porridge or sour gruel merely brought down from the hearth, still warm, can be drunk, having swirled it around; that does not constitute an invitation [because]⁴ a solid limit is not perceived even at

^{h–h}≠ Sp IV 825,if. ^{i–i}≠ Sp IV 822,20–23 ^{j–j}≠ Sp IV 822,24–23,5

¹ This refers to the distance between the donor and the bhikkhu.

² For details, see *BD I* 83 n. 4.

³ *odhi*; this is a limit dependent on the consistency of the cooked rice. If there is a fixed limit, it counts as cooked rice, that is, as a meal; if it is liquid, it counts as gruel (*yagu*).

⁴ *yasmā* Kkh 180, n. 21, has *yasmā* for *yassa* of the main text; it then would have to be translated as “because [there,] a limit is not perceived even on the occasion of having it received by [someone’s] hand”. In the slightly deviating

⟨181⟩*Suddhapācittiya 35 M*

361

the occasion of having [it] received by whoever's hand. But if, when the heat has gone, it becomes solid, shows a solid limit, ⟨181⟩ again it constitutes an invitation; the former thin state does not protect [the bhikkhu from having received an invitation]. Even if — after having thrown in many leaves, fruit, and sprouts — also, a fistful¹ of grains are thrown in, [and] if at the time of eating a solid limit is perceived, it constitutes an invitation.

[If] at an invitation without gruel, [thinking], "We will give gruel", having filled water, congee, and milk, etc., in a meal (*bhatta*), they give it [saying], "Take gruel", although it is thin,² it indeed constitutes an invitation.³ But if, when the water, etc., are boiling, throwing [the food] in and cooking [it] they give it, it comes under the category of "gigel" indeed.^{j k} If even in the gruel a piece of meat or fish — even the size of a mustard seed — or sinew is thrown in, it constitutes an invitation.^k
^aExcept for the kernels of the appropriate grains spoken of, food made from various sorts of other kernels of bamboo, etc., or radishes, roots, and fruit, does not constitute an invitation.^a

(2) ^b"Porridge" (*kummāso*, Kkh 180,18) is made from barley [grains]. But porridge made from other things — beans, etc. — does not constitute an invitation.

(3) "Flour"^b (*sattu*, Kkh 180,18) is made having roasted the seven grains. ^cThe powder (*cūṇṇa*) made by grinding up kernels of rice roasted by hard-processing^{d c} as well as bran (*kuṇḍaka*) ^dcome into the category of "flour" indeed. But bran [of grain] roasted by evenly processing,^d

^{k-k}≠ Sp IV 823,6ff. ^{a-a}Sp IV 823,9ff. ^{b-b}≠ Sp IV 823,20ff. ^{c-c}≠ Sp IV 823,26f.
^{d-d}Sp IV 823,27f.

Sp parallel neither *yassa* nor *yasma* is found.

¹ lit. "grains the size of a fist" (*muṭṭhimattā tanḍulā*).

² That is, it is liquid, and has no solid limit (*odhi*).

³ According to Sp this is the case, because here there is originally a solid food which they make thin by adding several liquids in order to turn it into a *yagu*. Kkh-nṭ (384,15–18) differentiates, however, if all the ingredients remain separate, then it counts as *bhattamissaka*, and constitutes an invitation; if they are mixed together, they do not. See Kieffer-Püllz 2013: II 1396, n. 13.

⁴ *khara-pāka* is not listed in the Pāli dictionaries (except for *TPMA*, which, however, is not very helpful). *khara* means harsh, rough; hard, solid; sharp, keen; fierce (*DOP* s.v. *khara*); *pāka* stands for cooking, baking, firing (*PED*

362 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨182⟩

or¹ dried in the sun, or whatever kernels or parched grain (*lājā*) there is, or flour and meal made from parched grain, [all these] do not constitute an invitation.^{-e}

In respect of (4) fish and (5) meat,^f if they give two pieces of fish or pieces of meat [that are] only the size of a lump of rice in the gruel of one drinking gruel, either in one bowl or various bowls, if he does not chew these [and] rejects whatever else [there is that is] sufficient for an invitation, [this] does not constitute an invitation. If one of those [two] is chewed [and] one remains in the hand or in the bowl, if he rejects the other one, that does constitute an invitation. If both are chewed, [and] nothing even the size of a mustard seed is left in his mouth, even if he rejects the other, that does not constitute an invitation.^{-f} But whoever chewing unlawful meat or an unlawful food arising from harming families, medical treatment, announcing superhuman attributes, money that has been accepted, etc., [106] or something else — either lawful or unlawful — if he rejects [it], that does not constitute an invitation. ⟨182⟩

^g—Thus, whatever he eats and whatever food, brought by one standing within arm's reach (*hattha-pāsa**), he rejects, that constitutes² an

e–e ≠ Sp IV 824,2f. f–f ≠ Sp IV 824,6–13 g–g ≠ Sp IV 825,1–7

s.v.), that is, some way of processing foods. In Indian medicine three types of boiling are differentiated *mṛdu*° (gentle or mild), *madhyama*° (medium or moderate), and *kharapāka* (hard or excessive). In Pāli we once have correspondences for all three (*patthinnā*°, *majjhima*°, *khara-pāka*, Ps-pt II 236), but more often for two of them, namely, for *madhyama*° which is represented by *sama*°, and *khara*°, which is identical. Depending on the excessiveness of the processing, the nature of the processed food differs, and with it the products that can be made out of them. This again is relevant for the question of whether some products generate an invitation or not, as is evident from Sp IV 823,26ff., from which the above sentences are borrowed.

¹ Kkh 181,15f.: *samapākabhajitānam pana ātapasukkhānam kuṇḍakam vā*. In Kkh *samapākahajitānam* and *ātapasukkhānam* could be understood as referring to one and the same product. But Kkh-pt inserts a *vā* after *ātapasukkhānam* (Kkh-pt 91,2: *samapākabhajitānam pana ātapasukkhānam vā kuṇḍakan vā ...*), showing that it understands *samapākabhajitānam* and *ātapasukkhānam* as two different ways of treating the kernels. This corresponds to the reading of Sp IV 824,1f.: *samapākabhajitānam pana ātapa sukkhānam* (v.l. *ātapasukkhānam*) *vā kuṇḍakam na pavāreti*.

² Kkh *pavāraṇam janeti* (with v.l. Po *āpajjati*) is the usual expression in Kkh. This section, however, is tacitly borrowed from Sp, and Sp reads *pavāranam*

⟨182⟩

Suddhapācittiya 35 M

363

invitation; knowing that, now the [following] regulation is to be understood for the sake of knowing [the invitation] as it occurs.

(i–ii) “Eating, food” (*asanam bhojanam*, Kkh 179,21): here, firstly, by whoever even a single lump is swallowed, there being food somewhere or other in the bowl, mouth, or hand, if he, indeed as one with an interest [in the matter], rejects another food with the stated characteristics, that constitutes an invitation.^g But if he is without an interest [in the matter], and [if] he is not desirous of swallowing that which is left in the bowl, etc., or is desirous of giving [it] to another, or is desirous of partaking of [it] having gone elsewhere, even if he rejects [food] — that does not constitute an invitation (*pavāreti*).¹

(iii) ^h—“[The donor] stands within arm’s reach” (*hatthapāse thito*, Kkh 179,21): but here, if a bhikkhu is sitting, from the furthest edge of [his] buttocks;² if he is standing, from the edge of his heels; if he is lying down, whichever side he is lying on, from the furthest edge of it, to whichever is the nearest limb of the donor, sitting, standing, or lying down — except for [his] outstretched hand — defining [it] according to its nearest edge, two-and-a-half spans is to be understood as “arm’s reach” (*hattha-pāsa**). Only for one rejecting [what] is brought [by the donor] standing there (i.e. within arm’s reach), it is an invitation; not beyond that [arm’s reach].

(iv) “[The donor] brings”³ (*abhiharati*, Kkh 179,22): means standing

^{h–h} ≠ Sp IV 825,23–86,4

āpajjati, a variant also found in Kkh. In the second half of the sentence, Kkh and Sp read *yathā āpajjati*. According to the context in Sp, this āpajjati takes up the *pavāraṇam āpajjati* of the preceding sentence. This also holds true for Kkh, where this relation is, however, blurred because *pavāraṇam janeti* is used for *pavāraṇam āpajjati* in the first half of the sentence.

¹ Kkh-nt 385,9ff: *patikkhipanto pi na pavāreti ti* (Kkh 182,9) *tasmin ce antare aññam bhojanam abhihaṭam, tam so patikkhipanto pi na pavāreti. kasmā? vippakataabhojanabhāvassa upacchinnattā.* “Even if he rejects [it, that does] not constitute an invitation: If in the interim another food is brought, [and] even if he is rejecting it, [that does] not constitute an invitation. Why? Because of [his] unfinished food having been interrupted.” (This is tacitly borrowed in part from Sp IV 825,11ff).

² Kkh C^e and Sp āsanassa “of the seat”.

³ Kkh 182,16. Since this is the fourth element, a new paragraph should start with this word in the edition, and what follows as a new paragraph (Kkh 182,18) should be connected directly to this sentence.

within arm's reach (*hattha-pāsa**) he offers [food] for acceptance. But if a bhikkhu, even one sitting next [to him], in fact without presenting the bowl resting in [his] hand or on a stand, says, "Accept [this] meal", there is no invitation for him who rejects it.¹ Having brought a basket with a meal, [and] having placed it on the ground in front of [a bhikkhu], even if spoken to in that manner (i.e. as above), this is exactly the method (i.e. there is no invitation). But having lifted it a little or lowered it, it having been said, "Accept", for him rejecting it, it is an invitation.^{-h}

²For one who is serving [the bhikkhus], ⁱ-having taken the basket with a meal, another [person saying], "I will carry it", does merely the holding, but only the one who serves carries it; therefore [the basket with a meal] is indeed brought (i.e. by the donor). Hence for him, in rejecting the one who takes it from a desire to give (i.e. the donor who serves), it is an invitation.³ But if [the basket with a meal] is merely touched by the one who serves (i.e. the donor), solely the other one ⟨183⟩ is carrying it, then for him, in rejecting the one who takes it from a desire to give (i.e. the donor who serves), it is not an invitation. But if [the meal] has been lifted up with a ladle (i.e. by the donor), it is [an invitation].⁴ Even if it [is] the same load for both (i.e. the donor and his helper), one rejecting [it], constitutes an invitation indeed.^{-i j-}If [a meal]

ⁱ⁻ⁱ≠ Sp IV 826,13–21 ^{j-j}≠ Sp IV 826,21ff.

¹ In this example the person who gives is the bhikkhu himself.

² Sp IV 826,4ff. gives some more examples. From these it is evident that the present paragraph about serving is not connected with the example of the two previously mentioned bhikkhus. In the case of serving with additional helpers it needs to be clarified whether the donor, who here is described as the one who serves (*parivesaka*), actually brings the food he is going to distribute or whether an aid does that for him. In the latter case, the fourth condition for the constitution of an invitation would not be fulfilled.

³ The fourth condition for an invitation to be constituted is fulfilled when the donor brings the food himself. This is done in the present case, since the one who helps the donor only holds the basket but does not carry it. The basket is carried by the donor, and consequently, the food he is going to give "is brought" by him.

⁴ Sp IV 826,18ff.: *kaṭacchunā uddhaṭabhatte* (B^e N^e; C^e E^e *uddhaṭamatte*; S^e *uddhanamatte*) *pana hoti. kaṭacchu-abhihāro yeva hi tassa abhihāro.* "But if the meal is lifted up with a ladle, it is [an invitation]. For the offering with the ladle is his (that is, the donor's) offering." This explanation is taken over by the commentator, too, Kkh-nt 385,²⁷.

⟨183⟩

Suddhapācittiya 35 M

365

is being given to an adjoining [bhikkhu, and] another [bhikkhu] covers [his] bowl [with his hand, then a meal] brought precisely for another [bhikkhu] has been rejected. Therefore, there is no invitation.

(v) “Rejection” (*paṭikkhepo*, Kkh 179,22): here, with respect to something brought (i.e. offered) verbally,^j a rejection does not become valid. But for one rejecting [something] brought physically, either by a bodily change, such as moving the fingers, etc., or by a vocal change, such as “Enough, do not give”, this constitutes an invitation.

k-[If] one brings savour with meat [and] says, “Take the savour”, [then] having heard this, there is no invitation for the one rejecting [it]. But if “Savour and meat” is said,¹ there is an invitation for the one rejecting [it]. Even if “Take this” is said, there is indeed [an invitation for the one rejecting it]. If the meat has been separated, even if it is said, “[It is] meat savour”, if there is a piece of meat even the size of a mustard seed, [107] there is an invitation for the one rejecting [it].^{2-k} If [meat] is not [in it], it is suitable.

^a-[If] they cook fish and meat, having mixed it with bamboo shoots, breadfruit, etc., [and,] having taken it, one says, “Take shoot curry; take breadfruit sauce.” Even so, it does not constitute an invitation. Why? Because of it being said with a name of what is not worthy of an invitation.^a But it being said, “[This is] sauce with fish and meat”³ or “Take this”, it constitutes an invitation. This is a summary here. The extended [version], however, is stated in the Samantapāśādikā.⁴

But with respect of going, etc., [the rule is:] in whichever bodily attitude he is invited, [by him] it is to be eaten, indeed not giving up that [bodily attitude].⁵

¹ k-k ≠ Sp 827,11–16 ^a-a ≠ Sp IV 827,23–26

² This resolution of the compound as a dvandva is the most generally accepted interpretation; resolution as a genitive tatpuruṣa is generally rejected, some also speculate that it can be resolved as an instrumental tatpuruṣa; see for details Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 221].

³ For this regulation, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 221] with n. 9.

⁴ Sp IV 827,26f. reads “fish curry”, “meat curry” (*maccha-sūpam mansa-sūpam*) instead.

⁵ Sp IV 826,24–28,21.

⁵ For details, see Appendix 33.

366 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* **⟨184⟩**

(i) ^b*Not left over (anatirittam, Pāt 58,2)*: not left over (resolution of compound); the meaning is: not in excess. But that is either [what] is not made [left over] by the seven types of legal acts¹ such as “[something] lawful made [left over]” (*kappiya-kata*)² etc., or [what] is the excess of an ill person. Therefore it is said in the Word Analysis ^c“[something] unlawful made [left over]”^{–c} (*akappiya-katam*), etc. There, whatever fruit or bulbs and roots, etc., are not made lawful by the five [methods] lawful for a recluse,³ as well as unlawful meat or unlawful food,⁴ this is unlawful (*akappiya*); such unlawful [food] made left over thus (i.e. with the words), “All this is enough”, ⟨184⟩ is to be understood as “[something] unlawful made [left over]” (*akappiya-katam*).

(ii) “[Something] not formally accepted is made [left over]” (*appati-ggahitakatam*, Vin IV 82,29) means: [something] indeed not formally accepted by a bhikkhu is made left over in the previous manner.

(iii) “[Something] not lifted made [left over]” (*anuccāritakatam*, Vin IV 82,30) means: [something] not lifted or lowered even a little by the bhikkhu who has come to make it lawful is made [left over].

(iv) “[Something] made [left over] not in arm’s reach” (*ahatthapāse katam*, Vin IV 82,30) means: [something] made [left over] by one standing outside arm’s reach of [the one] who has come to make it lawful.

(v) “[Something] made [left over] by one who has not eaten” (*abhuttāvinā katam*, Vin IV 82,30f.) means: whoever makes it left over, by him it is made [left over] not having eaten food sufficient for an invitation.

(vi) “[Something] made [left over] by one who has eaten, [who] has been invited [and, having declined,] has risen from his seat” (*bhuttāvinā pavāritena āsanā vutthitena katam*, Vin IV 82,31f.): this is clear.⁵

^{b–b} ≠ Sp IV 829,6–29 ^{c–c} Vin IV 82,29

¹ *sattāhi vinayakammākārehi*; This refers to the seven methods by which food is legally made to be left over food or not left over food. For this understanding of the passage, see Kieffer-Püllz 2013: II [Z 223] and 1419f., nn. 24, 25.

² This takes up Vin IV 82,33f.

³ *samaṇa-kappiya*; this stands for *samaṇa-kappa* used in the Vinaya. See Vin II 109,25ff. for the five methods; cf. Kieffer-Püllz 2013: II 1285.

⁴ Meat and other food can be unlawful per se, or they can be made unlawful because of a certain treatment.

⁵ Though both commentaries, Sp and Kkh, declare that this is clear, things are not so clear with this sixth method. See Kieffer-Püllz 2013: II 1422.

⟨184⟩

Suddhapācittiya 35 M

367

(vii) “[Something] made [left over] without it being said, ‘All this is enough’” (*alam etam sabban ti avuttam*, Vin IV 82,32) means: making an utterance it not being said thus.¹

Thus, by these seven types of legal acts, what is left over is not made lawful, and what is not left over by one who is ill, both of these are not left over. But “left over” is to be understood according to the opposite way of exactly this (i.e. the way described above).

Moreover, here, “It becomes made [left over] by one who has eaten” (*bhuttāvinā katan hoti*, Vin IV 82,35) means: even [something] made [left over] — having chewed even a single lump of boiled rice (*sitttha*) or a piece of meat from the bowl of the one sitting immediately next to him — “becomes made [left over] by one who has eaten.”^{–b} Whoever, having thus eaten very early, is invited, [and having declined,] remains seated, when the [meal-]time is near, he is allowed to make lawful almsfood brought [and] offered by a bhikkhu. But if they fill in other food for the one who is eating [it] in that [food] which has been made lawful, [then] he is not allowed to make this [lawful] again.² For it is said,³ d—“What is not made [lawful], that can be made [lawful], and by whom it is not made [lawful], by him it can be made [lawful].”^{–d} Therefore it is not suitable to make it [lawful, because] if this dish is being made [lawful], it becomes made [lawful] together with that which

¹d–d ≠ Sp IV 830,8f.

¹This list of seven is given in the Vinaya in explanation of *anatirittam*. Thus, all seven foods made into leftovers in the stated manner are in fact non-leftovers. This is so because the method by which these objects are made leftovers is wrong, as is illuminated by the next passage in the Vinaya, where the seven leftovers are described (Vin IV 82,33–37). For details, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 223].

²For this entire section on making food lawful, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 223], 1424.

³This statement, in reverse order, is marked in Sp IV 830,8f. by *ti*, which might indicate a quotation. In Kkh 184,²¹ the sentence is marked as a quotation by *ti vuttam*. This has been taken by the editors of Kkh as referring to Sp IV 830,8f. (Kkh 184, n. †). But Kkh-nṭ 387,^{11f.} explains that this is a quotation from the Sīhalatthakathās. Thus von Hinüber’s (200ob: 133) assumption that only Nānakitti’s Samantapāsādikā-Atthayojanā (around 1492/3) mentions the source is to be corrected. Nānakitti obviously took it over from Kkh-nṭ, see also Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II 1417, n. 19.

368 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨185⟩

was made [lawful] first. But in another bowl it is suitable that this one¹ or another one make it [lawful]. If [it is] made [lawful] thus (i.e. in a separate bowl) it is suitable to eat [it], even if it is mixed with what was made [lawful] first. And not only for him, even for others who have been invited, it is suitable to eat [it] — excepting, however, the one by whom it was made [lawful]. ⟨185⟩ But, having cleaned face and hand, it is to be eaten in a manner that it does not become mixed with what has not been made [lawful].

But left over by one who is ill is not only the remainder of the food of an ill person, but also whatever is brought for an ill person [saying], [108] “Today or tomorrow or whenever he wishes, then he will chew [it]”; all of that is to be understood as left over by one who is ill.

Solid food or soft food (khādanīyam vā bhojanīyam vā, Pāt 58,2f) means: whatever food [that is allowed during the time period] up to the [right] time (*yāva-kālika*).

Should chew or partake of, [an offence entailing] expiation (khādeyya vā bhuñjeyya vā pācittiyyam, Pāt 58, 3f): here, for one invited in the stated way when formally accepting any not left-over food for the sake of swallowing, there is [an offence of] wrong doing in accepting. There is [an offence entailing] expiation with each swallow.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning many bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “eating elsewhere” (= 3. *subject matter*).

This, [i.e.] “not left over” is the supplementary prescription (*anupaññatti*) here. [The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.² For one taking [edibles allowed] during a watch of the night, etc.,³ for the sake of nutriment and for one swallowing [them] without food, there is [an offence of] wrong doing. Likewise, for one thinking it was not left over when it was left

¹ That is, the person who also made the first dish lawful.

² Vin IV 83,7ff. (BD II 331).

³ The “etc.” here, and in the following rules, comprises the same offences, but with respect to “[edibles allowed] for the remainder of [one’s] life” (*yāva-jīvika*) and “[edibles allowed] during seven days” (*sattāha-kālika*).

⟨185⟩

Suddhapācittiya 36 M

369

over, and for one who is in doubt,¹ [there is an offence of wrong doing] (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

But there is no offence for one thinking it was left over [when it was left over],² for one taking [it] with the thought, “Having caused it to be made left over, I will eat [it],”³ for one taking for the sake of another,⁴ for one eating [edibles allowed] during a watch of the night,⁵ etc., without [other] food⁶ by virtue of the enjoyment permitted for them,⁷ and for one who is insane, etc.⁸ (= 7. non-offence).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) being invited [and having declined], (ii) the food not being left over, (iii) swallowing at the right time (= 9. constituent factors).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are exactly the same as for the first *kathina* rule (Niss 1 M),

but [the offence against] this [rule originates in] activity and inactivity (= 11. activity).

The commentary on the first rule about invitations is finished.

[6. The commentary on the second rule about invitations]

[36. Pāc M: If any bhikkhu having brought [it] should invite with solid food or soft food that are not left over, a bhikkhu who has eaten , [but

¹ Vin IV 83,12f. (BD II 331).

² Vin IV 83,13f. (BD II 331).

³ Vin IV 83,15f. (BD II 331).

⁴ Slightly deviating Vin IV 83,16 (BD II 331).

⁵ Vin IV 83,17f. (BD II 331).

⁶ *nirāmisa*. Cf. Sp IV 830,32–31,3: *yam yāmakālikādīsu ajjhohāre ajjhohāre dukkaṭam, tam asamsaṭṭhavasena vuttam. sace pana āmisasaṭṭhāni honti, āhāratthāya pi anāhāratthāya pi paṭiggahetvā ajjhoharantassa pācittiyan eva.*

“What is [taught as an offence of] wrong doing with each swallow regarding [edibles allowed] during a watch of the night, that is said by virtue of [them] not being mixed with [food]. But when [edibles allowed during a watch of the night] are mixed with food, whether it is formally accepted for nutriment or not for nutriment, [there is] indeed an [offence entailing] expiation for him swallowing [it].”

⁷ This means that there is no offence as long as they follow the rules for the enjoyment of edibles allowed during a watch of the night.

⁸ Kkh 185,13–16 does not explicitly list the leftovers of an ill person mentioned in the Vinaya (Vin IV 83,17).

370 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨186⟩

is] invited [to eat more, saying] knowingly [and] looking to find fault, “Here, bhikkhu, chew or partake of [this”, then] there is [an offence entailing] expiation when [it is] eaten.

(Pāt 58,6–9 = Vin IV 84,14–17])

In the sixth [rule]¹ *Having brought [it] should invite (abhihaṭṭhum pavāreyya, Pāt 58,7f.)* means: having brought [it] should invite him thus. “Here, bhikkhu, chew or partake of [it].”

Knowingly (jānam, Pāt 58,8) means: having heard or having seen [it, a bhikkhu] knows about the [other bhikkhu’s] state of being invited [and having declined].

^e—*Looking to find fault (āsādanāpekkho, Pāt 58,9)* means: looking for fault, [looking to make] an accusation, [looking] to make [someone] be troubled.^e ⟨186⟩

There is [an offence entailing] expiation when [it is] eaten (bhuttasmin pācittiyam, Pāt 58,9): here, in offering there is first of all [an offence of] wrong doing. If he accepts it, there is again [an offence of] wrong doing for the one who offers. But while he is eating it, with each of his swallows there is [an offence of] wrong doing for the one who offers. There is [an offence entailing] expiation at the end of the meal.²

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning a certain bhikkhu (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “inviting with food that was not left over, having brought it” (= 3. *subject matter*).³

[The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is [an offence entailing] expiation for one thinking he is invited when he is invited.³ There is [an offence of] wrong doing for one who is in doubt, for one bringing [edibles allowed] during a watch of the night, etc.,⁴ for the sake of nutriment, and in formally accepting

^e—^eSp IV 831,22f.

¹ This rule belongs to those building a bridge between the old locative rules, and the *yo pana bhikkhu* rules, see von Hinüber 1999: 53.

² All the offences arise for the one offering who is the focus in this rule. The bhikkhu who eats the offered food is to be dealt with according to the preceding rule (Pāc 35 M).

³ Vin IV 84,31 (BD II 334).

⁴ For “etc.”, see below, p. 498, n. 1.

⟨186⟩*Suddhapācittiya 37 M*

371

and swallowing them (i.e. the edibles just mentioned),¹ and for one thinking he is invited when he is not invited, and for one who is in doubt² (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

But there is no offence for the one who thinks he is not invited [when he is not invited], and who gives [it] having caused it to be left over, or who gives it having caused it to be [left over, saying,] “Eat”, or who gives it [saying,] “Go away, as one taking [it] for the sake of another”, and who gives [edibles allowed] during a watch of the night, etc., [saying,] “Eat [them] when there is a reason”, and for one who is insane, etc.³ (= 7. non-offence).

These are the five constituent factors here: (i) the fact of being one who was invited [but who declined], (ii) thinking he is invited, (iii) wishing to find fault, (iv) the existence of an invitation with not-left-over food, having brought it, (v) the end of the food (= 9. constituent factors).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] taking what is not given (Pār 2 M),

but the [offence against] this [rule is done with an] unpleasant [type of] feeling (= 17. *feeling*).

The commentary on the second rule about invitations is finished. [109]

[7. The commentary on the rule about eating at the wrong time]

[37. Pāc M: If any bhikkhu should chew or partake of solid food or soft food at the wrong time, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.

(Pāt 58,11f. = Vin IV 85,33f.)]

In the seventh [rule],⁴ *At the wrong time* (*vikāle*, Pāt 58,11) means: when the right time has gone; the intention is: from the passing away of midday to the arising of the sun. Therefore, whatever bhikkhu in this interval of time formally accepts for the purpose of swallowing solid food (*khādanīya*) or soft food (*bhojanīya*) coming under the general heading of food (*āmisa*), either raw or cooked, based on any roots and fruits of the forest, for him there is [an offence of] wrong doing in [his] formal acceptance. There is [an offence entailing] expiation with each swallow.

¹ Vin IV 84,34–37 (BD II 334).

² Vin IV 84,37–85,2 (BD II 334).

³ All the cases correspond to the non-offence clause in Vin IV 85,3–7 (BD II 334).

⁴ For the connection between this rule and an older version in the Cullavagga, see von Hinüber 1999: 87.

372 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* 〈187〉

[This rule] was prescribed at Rājagaha (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of seventeen bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “eating at the wrong time” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple 〈187〉 [offence entailing] expiation.¹ There is [an offence of] wrong doing in formally accepting for the sake of nutriment and in swallowing [edibles allowed] during a watch of the night, etc., for one thinking it is the wrong time when it is the right time, and for one who is in doubt² (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one who thinks it is the right time when it is the right time, for one eating [edibles allowed] during a watch of the night when there is a reason, and for one who is insane, etc.³ There is no offence even for a ruminator in the manner prescribed [by the words], “I allow rumination for a ruminator, but it is not to be swallowed, bhikkhus, having taken it outside the [opening] of the mouth”⁴ (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) being the wrong time, (ii) being [the period] up to the [right] time (*yāva-kālīka*), (iii) swallowing (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., are the same as for [the rule] about sheep’s wool (Niss 16 M).

The commentary on the rule about eating at the wrong time is finished.

[8. The commentary on the rule about storing up]

[38. Pāc M: If any bhikkhu should chew or partake of solid food or soft food having stored it up, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.

(Pāt 58,14f. = Vin IV 87,1f.)]

In the eighth [rule], *having stored it up* (*sanniddhikārakam*, Pāt 58,14):
f—the words making (or maker, *kāro*), making (*karaṇam*) and action (or activity, *kiriyā*) are one in meaning; *sannidhi-kāram* (“stored up”)

f-f ≠ Sp IV 838,19ff.

¹ Vin IV 86,6ff. (BD II 337).

² Vin IV 86,8–12. (BD II 337).

³ Vin IV 86,13f. (BD II 337).

⁴ This non-offence case is not mentioned in the Vibhaṅga, but is added here from the Cullavagga (Vin II 132,28ff., BD V 183).

⟨188⟩*Suddhapācittiya 38 M*

373

means: there is storage of it (lit. “making a storing”; *sannidhi-kāro*); *sannidhi-kārakaṃ* is the same as *sannidhi-kāram*. This is the name of [something] which is made to pass beyond one night after having formally accepted it.^{–f} Therefore ^g–there is [an offence of] wrong doing in the formal acceptance for one accepting whatever is thus stored up, [edibles allowed during the time period] up to the [right] time or [edibles allowed] during a watch of the night, [with the thought], “I will swallow [them].” There is [an offence entailing] expiation with each swallow.

Even if a bowl is badly cleaned, when the scratching of someone rubbing it with his finger is perceived, or the grease has entered into the joins of a bowl with joins,¹ which flows forth out of [the bowl] warming up in the heat, or is seen in hot gruel when it is accepted, even with respect to such a [badly cleaned] bowl² there is [an offence entailing] expiation for one eating [in it] the next day.^{–g h}–But whatever [food] a bhikkhu who is indifferent [to the food] has left behind for novices^{–h} [and] which he eats, having [re]gained [it] that was stored up by them,³ that is suitable. ⁱHaving formally accepted it himself, there is [an offence entailing] expiation for him eating [it as] a lawful meal on the second day^{–i} because it was indeed not given up [by him].^{4 j}–But among unlawful [foods], in the case of human ⟨188⟩ flesh there is [an offence

^{–g}–^h≠ Sp IV 838,24–32 ^{–h}≠ Sp IV 839,3f. ⁱ–^jSp IV 839,5f. ^j–^j≠ Sp IV 839,7–10

¹ *ganṭhika-patta*; normally used with respect to an iron bowl disfigured with joins. It is generally mentioned that such a bowl is difficult to clean; for details, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II 1443, n. 22.

² “Even with respect to such a bowl” is said, because Pācittiya 38 is about storing, and the rests of food sticking to a badly cleaned bowl are not what one considers strictly speaking as stored. That is why the commentator has to stress that Pācittiya 38 also covers such badly cleaned bowls.

³ After storing it, the novices give it to the bhikkhu; this is clear from the slightly different parallel in Sp IV 839,3–6: *yam bhikkhū nirapekkhā sāmaṇerānam pariccajanti, tañ ce sāmaṇerā nidahitvā denti sabbam vattati*. “Whatever [food] bhikkhus indifferent [with respect to it] leave behind for novices, if the novices give that, having stored it, all [that] is suitable.”

⁴ The bhikkhu, not having given up the lawfully accepted food, eats it the next day, which means that he has stored it.

374 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨188⟩

entailing] expiation together with a grave [offence];¹ but in respect of the rest (i.e. the other sorts of prohibited meat), it is [an offence entailing expiation] together with [an offence of] wrong doing.

There is [an offence entailing] expiation for one swallowing [edibles allowed] during a watch of the night (*yāma-kālika*) when there is a reason;² [an offence entailing expiation] together with [an offence of] wrong doing for one swallowing [edibles allowed during a watch of the night] for nutriment.³ But whoever ^k-as one being invited swallows [food] that has not been made left over,⁴ ^k a further [offence entailing] expiation arises for him in all cases.⁵ If he swallows at the wrong time, there is no offence because of not left over food in all cases. And when there is a reason, there is no offence because of the wrong time in regard to [edibles allowed] during a watch of the night, etc.⁴ In respect of the rest, the [offence entailing] expiation definitely increases [in number] because of the wrong time.⁵ The store [of food]⁶ of a bhikkhu is suitable for a bhikkhunī; and the store [of food] of a bhikkhunī is suitable for a

^k-^k ≠ Sp 839,11

¹ Among the various types of flesh prohibited for monastics (see above, p. 257, n. 1), human flesh leads to a grave offence (*thullaccaya*, Vin I 218,34ff.) while the forbidden flesh of certain animals leads to an offence of wrong doing (*dukkata*, Vin I 219,7ff.). For the regulations concerning the consumption of various types of flesh, see above, p. 48, n. 3; see also Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I [Z 127].

² That is, when edibles allowed during a watch of the night (*yāma-kālika*) are stored overnight. For a discussion of some of these cases, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 229].

³ For details, see Appendix 34.

⁴ See the slightly different variant in Sp IV 839,19f.: *yāmakālikesu vikālapaccayā anāpatti, anatirittapaccayā pana vikāle sabbavikappesu anāpatti*. “In regard to [what is allowed] during a watch of the night [there is] no offence because of the wrong time, but because of [food] not left over [there is] no offence regarding the wrong time in all cases.”

⁵ That is, because of a transgression of Pāc 37 M.

⁶ In the present case, and in the Cullavagga passage referred to below, store (*sannidhi*) is used in connection with food (*āmisa*). Therefore, we understand *sannidhi* here to refer to a store of food. This does not exclude the possibility that the store regulation can also refer to other objects.

188*Suddhapācittiya 38 M*

375

bhikkhu. [It is said] “it is suitable”¹ because of having been allowed in the Bhikkhunī-kkhandhaka.²

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning venerable Belatṭhasīsa (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “food that had been stored up” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*). **110**

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.³ But⁴ in the formal acceptance for the sake of nutriment of [edibles restricted to] seven days (*sattāha-kālika*) and [edibles allowed] for the remainder of [one’s] life (*yāva-jīvika*) and in swallowing [them], there is [an offence of] wrong doing. And as these are not lawful for nutriment, so also when they are mixed with [edibles allowed during the time period] up to the [right] time (*yāva-kālika*), etc., [there is an offence of wrong doing]. For the [following] is said [in the Vinaya], ^a—“Bhikkhus, together with [edibles allowed during the time period] up to the [right] time (*yāva-kālika*) [edibles allowed] during a watch of the night (*yāma-kālika*) [formally] accepted that day are lawful at the right time (*kāle*); they are not lawful at the wrong time (*vikāle*)”,^a etc.⁵ Therefore, even if he obtains this and

^a—^aVin I 251,15f.

¹ In Kkh (188,10) there is an *iti* after *vatti*. Thus it could refer to some earlier case where this has been declared suitable already.

² This refers to Vin II 270,9–12, 24–28 (BD V 373f.), discussing the same case once for bhikkhus, once for bhikkhunīs. As an example, the first version is given here, Vin II 270,9–12: *tena kho pana samayena bhikkhūnam sannidhi-katañ āmisam ussannanam hoti. Bhagavato etam atthāñ ārocesuṁ. “anujānāmi, bhikkhave, bhikkhūnam sannidhiñ bhikkhunīhi bhikkhūhi paṭiggahā-petvā paribhuñjituñ” ti.* “Now at that time the food that was stored for bhikkhus was abundant. They told this matter to the Lord. He said, ‘I allow, bhikkhus, bhikkhunīs to make use of a store [of food] for bhikkhus, they having been caused to formally accept it by the bhikkhus.’” (Based on BD V 373f.).

³ Vin IV 87,10–13 (BD II 339).

⁴ The author adds this case with “but” because the triple offence entailing expiation mentioned before refers to regular food, namely, *khādaniya* and *bhojaniya*.

⁵ For the remaining text, see BD IV 348, and Kieffer-Pülz 2013: III 2328, n. 9.

376 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* 〈188〉

that mingled with this and that, if it has an unmixed flavour or is well cleaned,¹ so that contact with the other [edibles] is not perceived, it is suitable to eat [each] in accordance with its own [suitable] time.²

^b—But if it has a mixed flavour^{—b} or is badly cleaned,³ ^c—it is not suitable. For edibles [allowed during the time period] up to the [right] time (*yāva-kālika*) transform all three edibles, (i.e. edibles allowed) during a watch of the night (*yāma-kālika*), etc.,⁴ [when their] flavours are mixed with its own [flavour] into its own (i.e. the *yāva-kālika* edibles') nature.⁵ [Edibles allowed] during a watch of the night (*yāma-kālika*) transform both the [edibles restricted to] seven days (*sattāha-kālika*), etc.,⁶ into its own (i.e. the *yāma-kālika* edibles') nature. [Edibles restricted to] seven days (*sattāha-kālika*) transform [edibles allowed] for the remainder of [one's] life (*yāva-jīvika*) into its own (i.e. the *sattāha-kālika* edibles') nature. Therefore, it must be understood that together with that (i.e. the edibles restricted to seven days, *sattāha-kālika*) formally accepted on that day, [edibles allowed] for the remainder of [one's] life (*yāva-jīvika*) formally accepted on that day or formally accepted previously are lawful for seven days;⁷ with [edibles] formally accepted two days [earlier], it is lawful for six days; with [edibles] formally accepted three days [earlier] it is lawful for five days, ... with [edibles] formally accepted seven days [earlier] it is lawful only on that very day. Exactly therefore indeed (*hi*) it is said [in the Vinaya], ^d—“With [edibles restricted to] seven days (*sattāha-kālika*), O bhikkhus, [edibles

^b—^b ≠ Sp V 1105,11f. ^c—^c ≠ Sp V 1105,11–29 ^d—^d Vin II 251,23f.

¹ *sudhatam*; referring to two different types of food served in the same bowl and neatly separated so they can be eaten according to the rules for each of them.

² That is, with the time window valid for the respective food.

³ *duddhatam*; referring to two types of food in the same bowl that are not neatly separated.

⁴ The other two being “[edibles allowed] for the remainder of [one's] life” (*yāva-jīvika*), and [edibles restricted to] seven days (*sattāha-kālika*).

⁵ He means that the *yāva-kālika* food by being mixed with the sauce or flavour (*rasa*) of the *yāma-kālika*, *sattāha-kālika*, and *yāvajīvika* edibles makes all of them become of the same nature as the *yāva-kālika* food.

⁶ And the “[edibles allowed] for the remainder of [one's] life” (*yāva-jīvika*).

⁷ The edibles allowed for the remainder of [one's] life (*yāva-jīvika*) thus transform into edibles restricted to seven days (*sattāha-kālika*). A bhikkhu eating them, therefore, has to follow the regulations valid for the *sattāha-kālika* edibles.

⟨189⟩

Suddhapācittiya 38 M

377

[allowed] for the remainder of [one's] life (*yāva-jīvika*) formally accepted¹ [are lawful for seven days],^{-d} without it having been said, “formally accepted on that day”.² ⟨189⟩ And here, in respect to going beyond the [right] time, the watch of the night, or seven days, the offences are to be understood by virtue of the rules about eating at the wrong time (*vikāla-bhojana*, Pāc 37 M), about storing (*sannidhi*, Pāc 38 M), and about medicines (*bhesajja*, Niss 23 M). But among these four [edibles limited as to time, only the two called [edibles allowed during the time period] up to the [right] time (*yāva-kālika*) [and edibles allowed] during a watch of the night (*yāma-kālika*) are [ones] kept inside (*anto-vuttha*) as well as [ones] stored up (*sannidhi*); [edibles restricted to] seven days (*sattāha-kālika*) and [edibles allowed] for the remainder of [one's] life (*yāva-jīvika*) may be even deposited in [what is not] a hut for the lawful (*akappiya-kuṭi*), without constituting a storing up (*sannidhi*).^{-c}

But the other two (i.e. [edibles allowed during the time period] up to the [right] time (*yāva-kālika*) and [edibles allowed] during a watch of the night (*yāma-kālika*), even if formally accepted that day, are not suitable together with [ones] kept inside (*anto-vuttha*) [what is] not a hut for the lawful (*akappiya-kuṭi*).^{-e} That is called “mouth storing up” (*mukha-sannidhi*). But in the Mahāpaccari it is said that it is [called] “kept inside” (*anto-vuttha*). There, the difference is only one of name.^{-e} But the offence remains [an offence of] wrong doing.³

There “[What is] not a hut for the lawful” (*akappiya-kuṭi*, Kkh 189.4,5) means: a house made for living in, [that is] the property of the Saṅgha, or [the property of] an ordained individual.

There, “[edibles allowed during the time period] up to the [right] time” (*yāva-kālika*, Kkh 189.3) and “[edibles allowed] during a watch of the night” (*yāma-kālika*, Kkh 189.3) [both] kept in a place which is sufficient as a joint sleeping place, whether belonging to the Saṅgha or being the property of an ordained individual, are called “[ones] kept inside” (*anto-vuttha*).

^{1–e}Sp V 1100,9ff.

¹ *paṭiggahitam*, is missing in Oldenberg’s Vinaya edition (Vin I 251,23f.), but is present in Vin B^e.

² Kkh 188, n. †, gives Vin I 251,15f. as a reference for this sentence. This should be corrected to Vin I 251,23f.

³ For a discussion of *anto-vuttha* and *mukha-sannidhi*, see Kieffer-Püllz 2013: III 2053, [Z 354].

378

Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation

⟨189⟩

There, “cooked” (*pakkam*) is called cooked inside (*anto-pakka*); but wherever [something] is cooked by oneself (*sayam pakkam*), it is called “self-cooked” (*sāmam pakkam*). All of that is not to be swallowed. Belonging to the same [category] indeed, even mixed together with this and that, there is [an offence of] wrong doing for one swallowing all this.

Therefore, in order to release [edibles] from [the state of being] kept inside and cooked inside, ^ffour lawful places (*kappiya-bhūmi*)^f were allowed by the Blessed One. The regulation of these is stated in the Samantapāśādikā.¹ But where they do not exist, there it is suitable to eat having made [the edibles] the property of one who is unordained. Even self-cooking is suitable as renewed cooking. There is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking it is stored up when it is not stored up or for one who is in doubt (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one thinking it is not stored up [when it is not stored up], for one eating the three [edibles allowed during the time period] up to the [right] time (*yāva-kālika*), etc.,² [111] having stored them, [and] not having gone beyond the time of each, [for one eating edibles allowed] for the remainder of [one’s] life (*yāva-jīvika*) even at all times when there is a reason, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) food, (ii) being stored, (iii) swallowing it (= 9. constituent factors).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are exactly the same as for [the rule about] sheep’s wool (Niss 16 M).

The commentary on the rule about storing up is finished.

^{f-f}Vin I 240,1f.

¹ Sp V 1098,12ff. The four lawful places are (1) one “authorised by a declaration [while it is being built]” (*ussāvanantikā*), (2) “one connected with what is fortuitous” (*gonisādikā*; where the monastery (*ārāma**)) or the individual buildings (*vihāra**) are not enclosed), (3) “[given or built by] a householder” (*gahapatī*), and (4) “one agreed upon [with a formula for a procedure]” (*sammutī* or *sammutikā*). See also Vin I 240,2f.

² The other two being [edibles allowed] during a watch of the night (*yāma-kālika*), and [edibles restricted to] seven days (*sattāha-kālika*).

⟨190⟩*Suddhapācittiya 39 M*

379

⟨190⟩ [9. The commentary on the rule about fine foods]

[39. Pāc M: *There are fine foods such as these: ghee, butter, oil, honey, sugar syrup, fish, meat, milk, and curds. If any bhikkhu who is not ill, having asked for such fine foods for himself, should eat them, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 58,18–22 = Vin IV 88,23–26)]

In the ninth [rule], *Fine foods (pañīta-bhojanāni, Pāt 58,18)* means: foods (*bhojana*) originating from the seven sorts of grain mixed together with fine [edibles] (*pañīta*). For just as a chariot yoked to thoroughbred horses is called a thoroughbred chariot, so here too, food mixed with fine [edibles] is [called] fine foods (*pañīta-bhojana*). Whatever fine [edibles] it is mixed with, however, they are called fine foods. In order to show the variety of them, [the Pātimokkha] says, “*Such as these: ghee, butter*” (seyyath’ idam sappi navanītan, Pāt 58,18f.), etc.

There, “ghee” (*sappi*, Pāt 58,19), etc., are to be understood exactly by the characteristics stated in the rule about medicines (Niss 23 M). But in respect of “fish” (*maccha*, Pāt 58,19), etc., every fish having the characteristics spoken of by the word “living in water” (*odako*)¹ is indeed a fish. Of whichever [animals] the “meat” (*mamsa*, Pāt 58,20) is lawful,² however, their meat and milk and curds are intended here.

Fine foods such as these (evarūpāni pañītabhojanāni, Pāt 58,20f.) means: whatever are called fine foods because of their being mixed with these [edibles such as] ghee, etc., fine foods of such a sort.

Not ill (agilāno, Pāt 58,21) means: for whom there is comfort even without these.

Having asked for himself (attano atthāya viññāpetvā, Pāt 58,21) means: here, however, whoever is not ill [and who] asks for pure ghee, etc.,³ for medicine, he is to be dealt with according to the Mahānāma rule (Pāc 47 M); when asking for four [edibles, i.e.] fish, etc.,⁴ he is to be dealt with according to [the rule concerning] asking for curry and

¹ Vin IV 348,10, *maccha* is equated with *odaka*.

² See above, p. 257, n. 1.

³ The others are butter (*navanīta*), oil (*tela*), honey (*madhu*), and sugar syrup (*phānita*).

⁴ The other three are, meat (*mamsa*), milk (*khīra*), and curd (*dadhi*).

380 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨191⟩

rice (Sekh 37); when asking for food mixed with ghee, etc., he is to be dealt with according to this [rule] (Pāc 39 M).

There, ^g-this is the regulation. [Saying,] “Give a meal with ghee; give having scattered ghee; give having mixed [it] with ghee; give [it] with ghee; give ghee and a meal”, for one asking thus there firstly is [an offence of] wrong doing because of asking. There is [an offence of] wrong doing in formally accepting [it]. There is [an offence entailing] expiation with each swallow. But if “Give a ghee-meal” is said, since like a rice-meal there is [also] nothing called a ghee-meal,¹ therefore, there is only [an offence of] wrong doing because of asking for curry and rice (Sekh 37). But if when “Give a meal with ghee” ⟨191⟩ is said, having given a meal [the donor] gives butter, milk, etc., or lawful goods [saying], “Having made ghee, eat it”, [or] “Seizing ghee for this,² eat it”, [the offence is] exactly in accordance with the object.³ But when “Give food with cow ghee” is said, whether he gives cow ghee, or, there being none, [gives] butter in the previous manner, or whether he gives simply a cow [saying,] “Eat with ghee from this”, [the offence is] exactly in accordance with the object.

But if being asked, “Give with cow ghee”, [a donor] gives with goat ghee, etc., it is a flawed appointment (*visāṅketa**). For this being so, one thing is given by someone [who was] asked for something else; therefore there is no offence. The same method [applies] also to [cases] such as “Give with goat ghee”. When “Give with lawful ghee” is said, if [the donor] gives with unlawful ghee, it is indeed a flawed appointment. If when “Give with unlawful ghee” is said, he gives with unlawful ghee indeed, there is only [an offence of] wrong doing in both formally accepting and using.^{4-g} In this manner the regulation is to be understood in

^{g-g} Sp IV 840,25–41,10

¹ Kkh-nt 391,11ff. explains that the expression *sappi-bhatta* is inconclusive since it can be understood as “a meal consisting in ghee” (*sappimayam bhattam*) or “a meal mixed with ghee” (*sappi-samsaṭṭham bhattam*).

² What is meant is that the bhikkhu should take ghee in exchange for the goods given to him.

³ The offence depends on the object and on the stage of action that has been reached (asked, accepted, swallowed).

⁴ Contrary to the usual distribution of offences, according to which there is an offence of wrong doing for asking, one for formally accepting, and an offence

⟨191⟩*Suddhapācittiya 39 M*

381

respect of all words.^h—But having asked in one place or in various places, [and] having made [what is] received into one with all [edibles] such as ghee, having a mixed flavour, then if he swallows even one drop with the tip of a *kusa* grass, there are nine offences entailing expiation.^{1–h} [112]

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “asking for fine foods” (= 3. *subject matter*).

This, [i.e.] “not ill” (*agilāno*, Pāt 58,21) is the supplementary prescription (*anupaññatti*) here (i.e. in Pāc 39 M).

[The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.² It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one who thinks he is not ill when he is ill, or for one who is in doubt³ (= 6. [sorts of] *offence*).

There is no offence for one who thinks he is ill [when he is ill], for one having asked at the time of being ill [and] eating when he is not ill, in respect of what is left by an ill [bhikkhu], in respect of [what is asked for from] the place of relatives and those who have invited, [what is] asked for for the sake of another, in what is obtained from one’s own resources, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are four constituent factors here: (i) being fine foods, (ii) not being ill, (iii) receiving by a request which has been made, (iv) swallowing (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., is that of the rule of journeying (Pāc 27 M).

The [offence against this rule originates in] activity (= 11. *activity*),

[has] no acquittal due to [lacking] awareness (= 12. *awareness*),

[is] not [dependent on] intention (= 13. *intention*),

^{h–h}≠ Sp IV 841,26–29

entailing expiation with each swallow, see above, pp. 349, 351, 368, etc. Here, even for the usage of the *akappiya-sappi* it is said to be only an offence of wrong doing.

¹ Details are found in Vmv II 310,3–12.

² Vin IV 89,8ff. (BD II 343).

³ Vin IV 89,10ff. (BD II 343).

382

Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation

⟨192⟩

[is] a fault according to a precept [laid down by the Buddha] (= 14. *fault*),

[is] a physical deed, a verbal deed (= 15. *deeds*),

[is done with] three [types of] thought (= 16. *thoughts*),

[with] three [types of] feeling (= 17. *feelings*).

The commentary on the rule about fine foods is finished. ⟨192⟩

[10. The commentary on the rule about tooth sticks]

[40. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should convey to the opening of his mouth nutriment that has not been given, except for water or tooth sticks, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 60,2f. = Vin IV 90,9f.)]

In the tenth [rule] ¹⁻ⁱ*Not given (adinnam, Pāt 60,2)* means: not given (*na dinnam*) by means of one or other among [one's] body, [something] attached to [one's] body, or [something] to be cast while standing within arm's reach (*hattha-pāsa**) of one accepting (*gañhantassa*) [it] by [his] body or [something] attached to [his] body.¹⁻ⁱ This is a name for [something] not formally accepted (*appatīggahitaka*). For it is not suitable for a bhikkhu to swallow [something] not formally accepted, even if it is his [own] property. [Something] formally accepted is suitable even if it is property taken on trust. Its characteristic mark is to be understood by the inversion of the [above] statement. For if anyone who is unordained, even an animal, standing within arm's reach (*hattha-pāsa**) of a bhikkhu or bhikkhunī, gives by means of one or other among [his] body, etc., [and] if that is formally accepted by the bhikkhu either with some limb of [his] body, or with [something] attached to it — [i.e.] some movable object,² even a bed — and [something] able to carry it — even the leaf of a tree not growing there, even a needle which is merely touched —

¹⁻ⁱSp IV 842,32–43,2

¹ Compare the definition of *dinnam* (Vin IV 90,12–15; BD II 345).

² *sañhārima*, not listed in *PED* and Childers, is used in the same sense as *āharima*. This is obvious from the replacement of the word *āharima* used in the Vinaya in a comparable statement at Kkh 334,21, see Kieffer-Püll 2013: II 1663, n. 3. Kkh-nṭ (393,21ff.) explains that it is an object movable by a person of average strength.

⟨193⟩

Suddhapācittiya 40 M

383

|that is formally accepted (*patiggahita*) indeed.

| Here (i.e. in this rule) there is no [object] attached to [an object
| which is] attached [to one's body].¹ Also, whatever j̄-is being given to
| the nose in a nose-dropper, or [whatever] an ill person accepts formally
| with the mouth, all that is suitable. For the measure of use of it alone is
| the criterion in this context.^j And there being previous use, even some-
| thing given afterwards into the bowl of one sleeping, being there [with-
| in] arm's reach (*hattha-pāsa**), it is indeed formally accepted. Also, what-
| ever falls into the hand of one who is just seated, [thinking], "I will
| accept it formally with the bowl", that is indeed suitable. Even dust
| fallen from a vessel which has been brought is suitable. ^k-There, [with-
| in] arm's reach (*hattha-pāsa**) is to be understood exactly in the way
| stated in the rule about an invitation (*pavāraṇā-sikkhāpada*, Pāc 35 M)²
| for those standing, sitting, and lying down. But if, among those who
| give and those who formally accept, one is in the air [and] one on the
| ground, by the head of the one on the ground and whichever is the
| nearest limb of the one in the air, except for [his] hand stretched out to
| give or to accept, according to its nearest edge the measure of arm's
| reach (*hattha-pāsa**) is to be defined.

| Even if one is in a well [and] one is on the rim of the well, or one in
| a tree [and] one on the earth, ⟨193⟩ the measure of arm's reach (*hattha-*
| *pāsa**) is to be defined exactly in the stated way.^k Standing there (i.e.
| in arm's reach), even if two or three novices, moving forward such a
| load which a man of average [strength] can throw up, put it into the
| bhikkhu's hand which is placed on the ground, [113] or, throwing it up,

^{j-j}-j̄ ≠ Sp IV 843,17ff ^{k-k}-k̄ Sp IV 844,2-9

¹ *patibaddha-ppaṭibaddham*; this refers to some object that is attached to an object attached to one's body; thus, it is an object only indirectly attached to one's body. As Kkh says, such indirectly attached objects do not play a role here. Sp rejects this possibility in connection with various rules, since according to it, *kāya-patibaddha-paṭibaddha* is subsumed under *kāya-paṭibaddha*, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 778; II 1468 and n. 6. Obviously this additional differentiation between something attached to one's body (*kāya-paṭibaddha*), and something attached to something already attached to one's body was an opinion held by the Abhayagirivāsin (Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II 1468).

² Pāc 35 M is called *pathama-pavāraṇā-sikkhāpada*. The reference is to Kkh 182,10ff, where *hatthapāse thito* is defined, see above, p. 363.

384 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* 〈193〉

they place it, even partly, in the outstretched hand of the bhikkhu, this is formally accepted indeed.

^a—But whatever dust falls into the bowl of one wandering for alms,^{-a} that is indeed not formally accepted. Therefore, ^b—only having formally accepted [it] (i.e. the dust), alms (*bhikkhā*) are to be taken (*gaṇhitabbā*). Not having formally accepted [it] (i.e. the dust) there is [an offence of] wrong doing [pointed out] in the Vinaya for one taking [alms with it].¹ But there is no offence for one eating it having formally accepted it again.²

If it is said [by him], “After [I] have formally accepted [it] (i.e. the bowl), give”, not having heard the statement or not having grasped (i.e. understood) [it] they indeed give alms; [this alms food] is released from the offence of wrong doing [pointed out] in the Vinaya; having formally accepted [the bowl] again, another alms is to be formally accepted. If a great wind causes dust to fall from here and there, it is not possible to accept alms. Having made the decision³ with the pure thought, “I will

^a—^aSp II 312,24f. ^b—^b≠ Sp IV 845,22–29

¹ *vinaya-dukkāta*, is understood as an offence of wrong doing pointed out in the Vinaya according to Kkh-nṭ 394,12. An explanation of it is given in Sp in the frame of the second Pārājika, Sp II 312,24–27: *yam pana piṇḍāya carantassa patte raje patite pattam appaṭiggahetvā* (Sp E^e adds *vā*) *adhovitvā vā tattha bhikkham gaṇhantassa dukkātam vuttam, idam vinayadukkātam nāma*. “But if dust has fallen into the bowl of one wandering for alms, not having formally accepted that [bowl] or not having it cleaned, for him taking alms therein, an [offence] of wrong doing is stated; this namely is an offence of wrong doing [stated] in the Vinaya (?).” For the classification of eight different offences of wrong doing, see Appendix 35.

² *puna*; actually no activity of a previous formal acceptance (*paṭiggahaṇa*) is described explicitly in the text, which would justify the “again” (*puna*). But taking (*gaṇhati*) alms (*bhikkhā*) always constitutes a formal acceptance, since the alms are offered to the monk, who then takes, that is, accepts, them. Thus the *puna* here refers to the fact that though the alms have been formally accepted by the monk, they need to be formally accepted again, because the dust that has fallen into the bowl while walking for alms has neither been formally accepted nor been removed beforehand. This dust thus causes a state of not being formally accepted for the entire content of the bowl.

³ *ābhogam katvā*; this meaning for *ābhoga* is not given in CPD, DOP, PED; Childers gives among others “thought, reflection”. Edgerton recommends an

⟨193⟩

Suddhapācittiya 40 M

385

give [it] to one who is unordained”, it is suitable to take it.^{-b} ^cHaving given it to one who is unordained, it is suitable to eat [it], having formally accepted [what] was returned¹ by that [unordained person] or [what was taken] on trust for him.^{-c} In respect of tears, saliva, mucus, etc., ^dwhatever drops from [its] place [and] falls into the bowl or hand, that is to be formally accepted. [If] it [remains] stuck to the [respective] limb it is indeed formally accepted.^{-d} If it is cut off as it is falling, it is not to be taken meanwhile, it namely is taken up [then].² This is not suitable, even if it is formally accepted afterwards.

But whatever medicine or root and fruit having been taken for the sake of his mother, etc., or [whatever] fruit-bearing branch having been taken up for shade, he goes, from that whatever he wishes, is suitable to eat having formally accepted [it] again. But whoever, ^ehaving grasped a fruit-bearing branch growing there or a creeper, shakes [it], for him the fruit obtained from it is not suitable, and he incurs [an offence of] wrong doing [because of] wrongly treating.^{3-e} For another one, [the fruit] is suitable. ^fBut it is suitable to lean on or^{-f} hang on a tree with fruits.⁴ Whatever other shoot, etc., grows up in [something], that has been deposited [after] having been formally accepted; that is indeed formally accepted. For as long as he is not indifferent in respect of what is released from the hand, or [as long as] it is not released from the hand because of being indifferent,⁵ for so long he does not give up formal acceptance. This is a summary here. But a detailed [explanation] is stated in the Samantapāsādikā.⁶

^{c-c}Sp IV 845,30ff. ^{d-d}≠ Sp IV 854,16ff. ^{e-e}Sp IV 852,6ff. ^{f-f}Sp IV 852,8f.

investigation of the Pāli material (*BHSD* s.v. *ābhoga*). In the context of Vinaya passages, *ābhogam karoti* has the meaning of “taking a decision”, “reach an agreement”.

¹ Lit. “was given back (or: again) by him” (*puna tena dinnam*).

² *uggahitaka*, “taken up” in contrast to *patiggahitaka* “formally accepted”.

³ *durupaciṇṇa-dukkatam*, see Appendix 35.

⁴ In Sp IV 852,9f. (E^e wrongly reads *na vattati* instead of *vattati*) it is explicitly stated thereafter that such a behaviour is not considered as wrongly treating the fruit tree according to the Mahāpaccarī.

⁵ Kkh 193,27 the full stop after *muccati* should be replaced by a comma.

⁶ Kkh 193 n. * gives Sp III 520 as the place of this detailed version, noting also what was given in Kkh E^e 1981, namely Sp IV 842ff. The latter is the correct reference.

386 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* 〈194〉

〈194〉 *The opening of his mouth (mukha-dvāram, Pāt 60,2) means: the tube of the throat. For whether it entered by the mouth or the nose, because [it] has to be swallowed by the throat, all of that is indeed [something that] is caused to enter the opening of the mouth.*

*Nutriment (āhāram, Pāt 60,2) means: whatever are [edibles allowed during the time period] up to the [right] time (yāva-kālīka), or during a watch of the night (yāma-kālīka), or [edibles restricted to] seven days (sattāha-kālīka), or [allowed] for the remainder of [one's] life (yāva-jīvika), all of this indeed is called nutriment because of the fact of having to be swallowed. There, all grains (dhañña), or everything that conforms to grains — what is counted as the ninefold great fruits, [i.e.] the palmyra [tree fruit], coconut tree [fruit], jackfruit, breadfruit, bottle gourd, white gourd, musk melon, watermelon, [and] a type of cucumber¹ (*elāluka*), and the other cereals (*aparāṇṇa*), and whatever other woodland roots, leaves, flowers, and fruits serve as nutriment — all of that is called [edibles allowed during the time period] up to the [right] time (yāva-kālīka) because of having to be eaten by midday. These eight drinks: ^gmango drink, rose-apple drink, coconut drink, plantain drink, honey-tree drink, grape drink, water-lily drink, *phārusaka* drink, ^{-g} and whatever conforms to these, i.e. drinks from the small fruits of the rattan palms (*vetta*),² tamarind trees (*tintīnika*), citrus trees (*mātuluṅga*), wood-apple trees (*kapiṭṭha*), mango trees (? *kosamba*),³ [and] karanda trees (*karamanda*),⁴ all of these made by unordained people, [114] having ground them up with cold water or having baked [them] in the sun, because of having to be eaten after having been deposited for up to the last watch of the night [at the latest], they are called [edibles allowed] during a watch of the night (yāma-kālīka). Exactly this manner applies also to the rest of the allowed fruits, leaves, flowers, and juices.⁵*

^g—g Vin I 246,15ff.

¹ Vin-vn-t II 64,14f. (ad v. 2144) alternatively gives the explanation that it is the *kakkarī* fruit, that is, the snake cucumber.

² Skt *vetra*, *Calamus rotang* (NWS s.v. *vetra*).

³ Perhaps identical with Skt *kośāmra* (*Mangiera sylvatica*), called the Nepalese mango?

⁴ *Carissa carandas*.

⁵ In Kkh 194,17 this final sentence is erroneously printed as the first sentence of the next paragraph.

⟨195⟩

Suddhapācittiya 40 M

387

The five medicines — ghee, etc., because they must be eaten having been deposited for up to seven days (i.e. within seven days) — are called [edibles restricted to] seven days. But except for this trio of [edibles allowed during the time period] up to the [right] time (*yāvā-kālika*), etc.,¹ and water which is freed from time [restrictions], the remaining roots, and various sorts of fruits, etc., which do not serve as hard or soft foods, are called [edibles allowed] for the remainder of [one's] life” (*yāva-jīvika*) because they can be eaten [even] having been deposited for the remainder of [one's] life, if there is a need.

Should convey (āhareyya, Pāt 60,3) means: should cause to enter.

*Except for water or tooth sticks*² (*aññatra udaka-dantaponā*, Pāt 60,3) means: this is said in order to dispel the scruples of those who are scrupulous by thinking it is nutriment in the case of water even when it is not nutriment, and by thinking, “This has been brought to the opening of the mouth”, in respect of a tooth stick. For it is suitable to drink water as much as one likes, and to use a tooth stick following the usage of cleaning the teeth. But except for these two, there is [an offence of] wrong doing ⟨195⟩ in the taking for one taking the rest in order to swallow [it]; there is [an offence entailing] expiation with each swallow. Even if the juice of the tooth stick enters inside [the mouth] of one who is unaware [of it], it is [an offence entailing] expiation indeed.³

[This rule] was prescribed at Vesāli (= 1. *provenance*) concerning a certain bhikkhu (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “conveying nutriment which was not given” (= 3. *subject matter*).

This, [i.e.] “except for water or tooth sticks” (*aññatra udaka-dantaponā*, Pāt 60,3) is the supplementary prescription (*anupaññatti*) here (i.e. in Pāc 40 M).

¹ That is, [edibles restricted to] seven days (*sattāha-kālika*) and [edibles allowed] during a watch of the night (*yāma-kālika*).

² IBH (*BD* II 345) translated *udaka-dantaponā* as “water for cleansing the teeth”, though indicating Rhys Davids and Oldenberg’s translation (*VinTexts* I 40) “water and a tooth-cleaner” (*BD* II 345, n.1); cf. Norman and Pruitt (Pāt 61) “water and a tooth stick”, Thānissaro (I 407) “water and tooth-cleaning sticks”.

³ The tooth-stick rule (Pāc 40 M) has the same origin as the sheep’s wool rule (Niss 16 M), and this is classified as “unintentional” (*acittaka*, Kkh 123,16). Thus, by violating these rules a bhikkhu commits an offence whether he acts with or without intention.

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking it is not formally accepted when it is formally accepted or for one who is in doubt² (= 6. *sorts of offence*).

There is no offence for one who thinks it is formally accepted [when it is formally accepted]; in the case of water and tooth sticks; ^h for one eating the four great foul things, taking them himself^{-h} when there is a need and ^h-there is no legalizer,^{3-h} and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *no-offence*).

ⁱ-And in this context an ill-spoken as well as an incompetent legalizer belongs to the category⁴ of “absent [legalizers]” indeed (i.e. he counts as if he is an absent legalizer). There being no ashes, having burned dry wood⁻ⁱ and, there being none of that, even having cut wet wood from a tree, it is suitable to make [ashes], and [it is suitable] to dig the earth for mud. ^j-But it is suitable^{-j} to take oneself^{-j}-this fourfold foul thing at a particular time, namely at the time of being bitten by a snake only.^{5-j} At another time it can be eaten after having caused it to be formally accepted.

These are the four constituent factors here: (i) being not formally accepted, (ii) being not allowed, (iii) the absence of insignificant things such as smoke,⁶ etc., (iv) swallowing (= 9. *constituent factors*).

^{h-h}Sp IV 854,24f. ⁱ⁻ⁱSp IV 854,25ff. ^{j-j}Sp IV 854,29f.

¹ Vin IV 90,21–24 (BD II 346).

² Vin IV 90,24ff. (BD II 346).

³ Thus not taking them formally (*paṭiggañhati*). This takes up Vin IV 90,27f. (BD II 346).

⁴ Lit. “stands in the faction”.

⁵ The four great foul things (*mahā-vikaṭa*) are allowed in case of snake bites as medicine at Vin I 206,7ff. (BD IV 280). They consist of excrement (*gūṭha*), urine (*mutta*), ashes (*chārikā*), and mud (*mattikā*). It is explicitly stated in the Vinaya that they may be taken by a bhikkhu himself if no legalizer is at hand.

⁶ *dhūmādi-abbohārikābhāvo*; this factor is mentioned also in Sp-ṭ III 75,19; in Vmv B^e II 38,23, it is mentioned as *dhūmādi-abbohārikatābhāvo*. Kkh-nṭ 396,16f. simply explains: *dhūmādi-abbohārikābhāvo ti* (Kkh 195,16) *dhūmapupphagandhadantakhayādi-abbohārikābhāvo*. This takes up some remarks in Sp IV 853,3–8: *bhikkhu dhūmavattim patiggahetvā dhūmam pivati, mukhañ ca kantho*

⟨196⟩*Suddhapācittiya 41 M*

389

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] sheep's wool (Niss 16 M).

The commentary on the rule about tooth sticks is finished.

The section about food, the fourth.

[e. The section about naked ascetics]

[1. The commentary on the rule about naked ascetics]

[41. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should give with his own hand solid food or soft food to a naked ascetic or to a male wanderer or to a female wanderer, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 60,8ff. = Vin IV 92,4ff.)]

In the first [rule] of the section about naked ascetics, there is a single [offence entailing] expiation for one giving by a single action any food (*āmisa*) to members of other sects such as naked ascetics. For one giving, after having divided it into portions, there is [an offence entailing] expiation in each action. ⟨196⟩

[This rule] was prescribed at Vesālī (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Venerable Ānanda (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “giving two cakes to a wanderer” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one giving water and tooth sticks, for one thinking it is

ca manusilāya litto viya hoti, yāvakālikam bhuñjituṇ vāṭati, yāvakālikena yāvajīvikasamsagge doso natthi. pattam vā rajaṇam vā pacantassa kāṇṇāṭ-samukhacchiddehi dhūmo pavisati, byādhipaccayaṇ pupphaṇ vā phalaṇ vā upasiṅghati, abbohārikattā vāṭati. “Having formally accepted an incense (?) ball (?) *dhūmavaṭṭi*, [if] a bhikkhu drinks the smoke, and [his] mouth and throat is as if kindled with red arsenic; [then] it is suitable to eat [edibles allowed during the time period] up to the [right] time (*yāva-kālika*). There is no fault in the mixture of [edibles allowed] for the remainder of [one’s] life with [edibles allowed during the time period] up to the [right] time. [If] smoke enters through the apertures such as ears, nose, mouth of one cooking a leaf or dye; [and if] by reason of illness he sniffs at a flower or a fruit; on account of its being negligible, it is suitable.” Sp is proceeding with several other instances, where things are insignificant (*abbohārika*) in this context.

¹ Vin IV 92,18ff. (BD II 349).

390 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨196⟩

a member of a sect when he is not a member of a sect, and for one who is in doubt¹ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one thinking he is not a member of a sect when he is not a member of a sect; for one causing one who is unordained to give; for one saying, “Take this”, having deposited a bowl in their vicinity; or for one giving into their deposited bowl,² for one giving external ointment; [115] and for one who is insane, etc.³ (= 7. non-offence).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) being a member of another sect, (ii) being not allowed, (iii) giving that which is to be swallowed into a non-deposited bowl with his own hand for the sake of swallowing (= 9. constituent factors).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] sheep’s wool (= Niss 16 M).

The commentary on the rule about naked ascetics is finished.

[2. The commentary on the rule about dismissing]

[42. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu [should say thus] to a bhikkhu, “Come, friend, let us go to the village or the market place for alms food”, [and then] having had anything given to him or not given to him, he should dismiss him [saying], “Go, friend, talking or sitting with you is not pleasant for me; talking or sitting is pleasant for me all alone”, having done it for only that reason and no other, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 60,12–17 = Vin IV 93,14–18)]

In the second [rule] *having had anything given or not given* (*dāpetvā vā adāpetvā vā*, Pāt 60,13f.) means: having had any food (*āmisa*) given or not given.

Should dismiss (*uyyojeyya*, Pāt 60,14) means: if being desirous of laughing together with a woman, sporting, [or] sitting down secretly together with a woman,⁴ he should dismiss saying, “Go”, etc.

Only that (*etad eva*, Pāt 60,16) means: making only this immoral conduct the reason, not another one, that is a proper reason.

¹ Vin IV 92,2off. (BD II 349).

² This is not mentioned explicitly in the Vinaya.

³ Vin IV 92,24f. (BD II 350).

⁴ Corresponds to the Word Analysis of Vin IV 93,26f. (BD II 352).

⟨197⟩*Suddhapācittiya 42 M*

391

[*An offence entailing*] expiation (*pācittiyam*, Pāt 60,17) means: there is [an offence of] wrong doing at first in the mere dismissing; but when he leaves one's range of sight or range of hearing by one footstep, there is another [offence of] wrong doing; in it being left by a second footstep there is an ^k-[offence entailing] expiation.¹ And here, standing in the open, the measure of the range of sight is twelve cubits (*hattha**); similarly, [the measure] of the range of hearing. But if there are walls, doors, encircling walls, etc., in between, the state of being separated by them indeed is “passing beyond the range” (*upacārātikkama*).^{2-k} ⟨197⟩

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Upananda (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “dismissing” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

Because of the order of dismissing, it is connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.³ There is a triple [offence of] wrong doing in respect of one who is unordained.⁴ For both of them, there is only [an offence of] wrong doing in finding fault with others⁵ (= 6. [sorts of] *offence*).

There is no offence for one dismissing with suitable causes such as “Together we shall both not make a living”, etc., and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are three constituent factors here: (i) there being the desire to practice a wrong practice, (ii) dismissing an ordained [person] for exactly this reason, (iii) the one thus dismissed passing beyond the [permitted] ranges (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] taking what is not given (= Pār 2 M).

The commentary on the rule about dismissing is finished.

^{k-k} Sp IV 855,28–31

¹ Corresponds to the Word Analysis of Vin IV 93,26–30 (BD II 352).

² The second example covers the case of two bhikkhus who are not in the open (*ajjhokāsa*).

³ Vin IV 93,33f. (BD II 352).

⁴ Vin IV 93,36–94,3 (BD II 352f.).

⁵ Vin IV 93,35ff. (BD 352f.).

[3. The commentary on the rule about “with [its] food”
 (or, “with [its sexual] enjoyment [going on]”)]

[43. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should take a seat having intruded upon a family “with [its] food” (or: “with [its sexual] enjoyment [going on]”; sabhojane), there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 60,19f. = Vin IV 95,7f.)]

In the third [rule] a—*sabhojanam* means: with two people¹ (*sa + ubho + janam*); that [family] with two people² (*sabhojane*, Pāt 60,19).

Alternatively, *sabhojane* (Pāt 60,19) means: with enjoyment; for the woman is the enjoyment of the man who is obsessed with passion, and the man of the woman. For that very reason it is said in the Word Analysis of this, b—“There is a woman, and also a man”,³ b etc.^{3-a}

Should take a seat having intruded upon (anupakhajja nisajjam kappayya, Pāt 60,19f) means: should sit down having forced his way in. The meaning is: whatever is the sleeping room of that family — [if it is] a large one (*mahallaka*) built in a large *catussāla* house,⁴ etc. — c—having left an arm’s reach (*hattha-pāsa**) from the door frame (*pīṭha-sāṅghāta**)⁵ of that, [if a bhikkhu] should sit down c—in a place close to the bed inside [it];⁶ or, [if it is] a small one, [if a bhikkhu] should sit down after going beyond the middle of that.⁵ For one sitting thus, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Upananda (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “sitting down having intruded” (= 3. *subject matter*).

a—aSp IV 856,17–20 b—bVin IV 95,10f. c—cSp IV 856,22f.

¹ In Kkh 197,13 these words are put in italics by mistake.

² *sabhojane* in Kkh 197,14 has to be put in italics, since it is a quotation from the rule.

³ Vin IV 95,10f. (BD II 356): *sabhojanam nāma kulam itthi c’ eva hoti puriso ca; itthi ca puriso ca ubho anikkhantā honti, ubho avitarāgā.* “Family with food (or: enjoyment) means: there is a woman and also a man, and both the woman and the man are not gone out, both are not without passion.”

⁴ *catussāla*, probably refers to an architectural form, namely a square or rectangular hall around a central courtyard, see Bandaranayake 1974: 28.

⁵ This takes up in slightly changed reading the explanation from the Word Analysis of this rule (Vin IV 95,13ff., BD II 356).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking it is a sleeping room when it is not a sleeping room, or for one who is in doubt² (= 6. [sorts of] *offence*).

There is no offence for one who does not think it is a sleeping room [when it is not a sleeping room]; for one sitting down, not going beyond the place with the stated characteristics; when there is a second bhikkhu present; or for one sitting down when both have gone out³ or their passion is departed; and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*). ⟨198⟩

These are the four constituent factors here: (i) a husband and wife whose passion has not departed [116] lying down together, (ii) being a sleeping room, (iii) the absence of a second bhikkhu, (iv) sitting down having intruded (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., are the same as for the first [rule entailing] defeat (Pār 1 M).

The commentary on the rule about “with [its] food” (or, “with [its sexual] enjoyment [going on]”) is finished.

[4–5. The commentary on the rules about sitting down in secret on a screened seat and sitting down in secret]

[44. Pāc M: If any bhikkhu should take a seat with a woman in secret on a screened seat, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.

(Pāt 60,22f. = Vin IV 96,14f.)]

[45. Pāc M: If any bhikkhu should take a seat with a woman in secret, one [man] with one [woman], there is [an offence entailing] expiation.

(Pāt 62,2f. = Vin IV 97,23f.)]

The fourth and fifth rules were prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Upananda (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “sitting on a screened seat” and “sitting down in secret” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

¹ Vin IV 95,17–20 (BD 356).

² Vin IV 95,20f. (BD 356).

³ That is, man and woman have gone out of the sleeping room.

394

Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation ⟨199⟩

Their origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are exactly the same as for the first [rule entailing] defeat (Pār 1 M).

The remainder of the manner of explanation is to be understood in the manner stated in respect of the two undetermined offences (Aniy 1, 2 M).

The commentary on the rules about sitting down in secret on a screened seat and sitting down in secret is finished.

[6. The commentary on the rule about visiting]

[46. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu being invited and being [provided] with a meal should go either before the meal or after the meal to visit [other] families without taking leave of a bhikkhu if one is present, unless [it is] on the [proper] occasion, there is [an offence entailing] expiation. There, this is the [proper] occasion: an occasion of giving robe material, an occasion of making up robes. This is the [proper] occasion here.*

(Pāt 62,5–9 = Vin IV 100,9–13)]

In the sixth [rule] *invited* (*nimantito*, Pāt 62,5) means: invited with one or other of the five foods.

Being [provided] with a meal (*sabhatto samāno*, Pāt 62,5) means: being [provided] with a meal by means of that invitation meal.

Without taking leave of a bhikkhu if one is present (*santaññ bhikkhūñ anāpucchā*, Pāt 62,6) means: d-seeing a bhikkhu inside the precinct boundary^d in the range of sight, whom it is possible to take leave of with the usual speech, not taking leave of such a one with such a speech as “I am going to the house of so-and-so” or “I shall make a visit.”

Either before the meal or after the meal (*purebhattam vā pacchābhattam vā*, Pāt 62,6) means: with whatever meal he is invited, with that eaten or not eaten. ⟨199⟩

Should go to visit [other] families (*kulesu cārittam āpajjeya*, Pāt 62,7) means: in whatever family he is invited, he should enter other families than that.

Unless [it is] on the [proper] occasion, there is [an offence entailing] expiation (*aññatra samayā pācittiyañ*, Pāt 62,7) means: if that bhikkhu, putting aside the twofold occasion with the stated characteristics, enters another family when midday has not passed, for him there is [an offence

^{d-d}Sp IV 857,16

⟨199⟩

Suddhapācittiya 46 M

395

[of] wrong doing in entering the precinct of the house. There is another [offence of] wrong doing [for him] if he goes beyond the threshold with one footprint. There is [an offence entailing] expiation in going beyond with the second footprint.

[This rule] was prescribed at Rājagaha (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Upananda (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “going to visit” (= 3. *subject matter*).

These, [i.e.] “Without taking leave of a bhikkhu if one is present” (*santaññ bhikkhum anāpuccchā*);¹ “before the meal or after the meal” (*purebhattam pacchābhattam*);² [and] “unless [it is] on the [proper] occasion” (*aññatrat samayā*)³ are the fourfold supplementary prescriptions (*anupaññatti*) here (i.e. in Pāc 46 M).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.⁴ It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking there is an invitation when there is not an invitation, or for one who is in doubt⁵ (= 6. [sorts of] *offence*).

There is no offence for one thinking there is not an invitation when there is [one]; for one entering at the right time, [or] after having taken leave of a bhikkhu if one is present, [or] not having taken leave of a bhikkhu if none is present; for one going along a road that is a road through another’s house or precinct of a house; for one going to a monastery inside a [settlement] (*antarārāma*),⁶ [or] to bhikkhunīs’ quarters, [or] to the sleeping houses of other sects, [or] to an assembly hall,⁷ [or]

¹ This is one supplementary prescription (Vin IV 100,5–13, BD II 365).

² Actually, *purebhattam* is mentioned in the first version of the rule already. Thus only the formulation with the addition of *pacchā-bhättam* is a supplementary prescription (Vin IV 99,18ff., BD II 364).

³ Since two occasions are mentioned, two supplementary prescriptions (Vin IV 99,23–100,4, BD II 364f.) are to be counted here, leading to four in all.

⁴ Vin IV 100,32–35 (BD II 366f.).

⁵ Vin IV 100,35–101,1 (BD II 367).

⁶ Vin IV 191,5 by mistake has *antaragāmā* for *antarārāmā* (accordingly misunderstood by IBH, BD II 367); see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II 1595 n. 9.

⁷ *paṭikkamana*; see also Vin IV 101,7 (misunderstood by IBH, BD II 367); see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II 1389, n. 4; Kieffer-Pülz 2015c: 383f.

396 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨200⟩

to a house for meals; in the case of disasters; and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the five constituent factors here: (i) acceptance of the invitation with one or other of the five foods, (ii) not taking leave of a bhikkhu [if one] is present, (iii) entry into a house other than the house for meals, (iv) not going beyond midday, (v) the absence of [the right] occasion or disasters (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [*sorts of*] *origin*), etc., are exactly the same as for the first *kathina* [rule] (Niss 1 M),

but [the offence against] this [rule originates in] activity and inactivity (= 11. *activity*).

The commentary on the rule about visiting is finished. [117]

[7. The commentary on the rule about Mahānāma]

[47. Pāc M: *An invitation [to accept] requisites for four months may be accepted by a bhikkhu [who is] not ill, unless [there is] a renewed invitation, unless [there is] a permanent invitation.*¹ *There is [an offence entailing] expiation, if he should accept [it] for longer than that.*²

(Pāt 62,11ff. = Vin IV 102,38–103,2)] ⟨200⟩

In the seventh [rule] *an invitation [to accept] requisites for four months* (*catumāsappaccayapavāraṇā*, Pāt 62,11) means: an invitation

¹ In the case of a renewed invitation the time frame is in accordance with the limit given in this invitation, in the case of a permanent invitation there is no limit. Thus in these two cases the rule concerning a four-months-invitation is irrelevant.

² The original translation by Norman (Pāt 63) “An invitation [to accept] requisites for four months may be accepted ..., other than a repeated invitation, other than a permanent invitation”, says exactly the opposite of what is meant, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II 1460, n. 19. Most translators relate *aññatra punapavāraṇāya* *aññatra niccapavāraṇāya* to the subsequent sentence (Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, *VinTexts* I 43; Nāṇadassana 2008; Thānissaro 2007: I 429), which would lead to “*If he should accept [it] for longer than that — unless [there is] a renewed invitation* (*VinTexts* has “unless there is a second invitation”), *unless [there is] a permanent invitation — there is [an offence entailing] expiation*”. But the *aññatra*-sentences are always supplementary regulations, and thus the original rule ran without *aññatra punapavāraṇāya* *aññatra niccapavāraṇāya*, i.e., “An invitation [to accept] requisites for four months may be accepted by a bhikkhu [who is] not ill. There is [an offence entailing] expiation, if he should accept [it] for longer than that.”

[to accept] requisites for an ill [bhikkhu] for four months¹ (resolution of compound). And all of this is said by virtue of the object. But this is the meaning in this context: Let it be an invitation for four months or a renewed invitation or a permanent invitation, all of those are to be accepted. They are not to be rejected [saying], “Now I have no illness.” They are to be accepted [saying], “But when [I have] an illness, I will ask.”

If he should accept [it] for longer than that (tato ce uttari sādiyeyya, Pāt 62,12f.) means: In this context, if there is a restriction made in respect of nights or medicines “only for so many nights”, or “so many medicines are to be asked for”, then there is [an offence entailing] expiation for one asking beyond the limit of nights or more than the limit of medicines; further, [there is an offence entailing expiation for one asking for] medicine not because he needs medicine;² or [for one asking for] one medicine [though] he needs another medicine.

[This rule] was prescribed in the Sakka [country] (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “asking for medicines” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.³ It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking it is longer than that when it is not longer

¹ That is to say, medicine (*bhesajja*). This restriction to requisites that are medicine becomes evident only from the Suttavibhaṅga, not from the rule itself, because “requisites” (*paccaya*) are there explained to be *gilāna-paccaya*, “requisites for an ill [bhikkhu]” (Vin IV 103,3f.). This explanation is taken up here in Kkh.

² *na bhesajjakaraṇīyena bhesajjam viññāpeti*, Vin IV 103,29; IBH’s translation misses the point “If he asks for medicine that is not to be used as medicine” (BD II 372). Sp IV 858,2f. quotes *na bhesajjena karaṇīye* (C^e E^e N^e [v.l II 881 n. 6] S^e; followed by Thānissaro 2007: I 431) with variant *na bhesajjena karaṇīyenā* (B^e E^e [v.l. IV 858, n. 1] N^e). Here clearly the reading of B^e is the correct one: *karaṇīyena* is the instrumental of the ground, and the instrumental of *bhesajjena* is dependent on *karaṇīya* (see von Hinüber 1968: § 121).

³ Actually, more than three offences are listed entailing expiation in the Vibhaṅga to this rule, namely eight (Vin IV 103,19–26, 28–32). The mention of three here is most probably in connection with the question of accepting requisites going beyond the time limit (Vin IV 103,3off.), because these directly refer to what is

398 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨200⟩

than that, or for one who is in doubt¹ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one thinking it is not longer than that when it is not longer than that; for one asking for other [medicines] or more medicines than those he has been invited with, there being a need, and even going beyond those nights [he is invited for], there being a need, having informed in accordance with the truth; and [there is no offence] for those who ask relatives or [ask] those [by whom] they have been invited² with an individual invitation, or [ask] those [by whom] they have been invited with an unlimited invitation, or for [those who ask] for the sake of another, or with [their] own resources, or for [those] who are insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

These are the four constituent factors here: (i) there being an invitation of the Saṅgha, (ii) asking for [more] medicines than the [ones invited to take],³ (iii) the fact of not being ill, (iv) going beyond the limit (= 9. constituent factors).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] a go-between (Sgh 5 M).

The commentary on the rule about Mahānāma is finished.

[8. The commentary on the rule about an army in array]

[48. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should go to see an army in array, unless [there is] an appropriate reason, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 62,15f = Vin IV 105,12f.)]

expressed in the rule. The others allude to information only contained in the Word Analysis.

¹ Vin IV 103,33f. (BD II 372).

² *pavārita*, actually mostly used in the sense of “having been invited”, especially in the non-offence clauses of the Vinaya (see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II 1528 n. 16). Since the bhikkhus who are not guilty are described here as those who ask *ñātake* and *pavārite*, *pavārite* must refer to those who have given the invitation to the monk (see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II 1038 n. 25).

³ *tato besajjavīññatti*; the factors are listed also in some of the *ṭīkās* — taken over from Kkh. But here they slightly deviate: Sp-t III 78,1: *bhesajjavīññatti*; Vmv II 41,2: *taduttari bhesajjavīññatti*. Since going beyond the limit (factor four) may work for the medicines as well as for the nights, *bhesajjavīññatti* would be sufficient as factor three. This would correspond with the reading of Sp-t.

Page 447 job: 1272818

⟨201⟩ *Suddhapācittiya 48 M* 399

⟨201⟩ In the eighth [rule], e-in array (*uyyuttam*, Pāt 62,15) means: with an array made. The meaning is: [an army] gone out from the village.¹

Army (*senam*, Pāt 62,15) means: having four parts.¹

Unless [there is] an appropriate reason (*aññatra tathārūpappaccayā*, Pāt 62,16) means: it is [an offence of] wrong doing in each footprint for one going only in order to see an army, there not being an appropriate reason. It is [an offence entailing] expiation for one seeing [it] while standing in the range of sight. Range of sight means: he sees [it] from where he stands. But having left that [range of sight], for [the bhikkhu] who sees it again and again there is [an offence entailing] expiation in each action.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. provenance) concerning the group of six (= 2. individuals) with respect to the subject matter “seeing an army” (= 3. subject matter).

This, [i.e.] “unless [there is] an appropriate reason” (*aññatra tathārūpappaccayā*, Pāt 62,16) is the supplementary prescription (*anupaññatti*) here (i.e. in Pāc 48 M).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. prescription).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. command).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.² It is [an offence of] wrong doing exactly according to the manner stated concerning going to see one or another among [the divisions] such as the elephants.³ Similarly it is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking it is arrayed

e-eSp IV 858,12f.

¹ Elephants (*hatthī*), horsemen (*assā*), chariots (*rathā*), and soldiers (*pattī*).

² Vin IV 105,24ff. (BD II 376).

³ This must not only include Vin IV 105,26f., but also the two subsequently mentioned offences of wrong doing, Vin IV 105,27ff.: *yattha thito passati, āpatti dukkaṭassa. dassanūpacāram vijahitvā punappunnām passati, āpatti dukkaṭassa.* “If he sees [one or other division of the army] from where he stands, it is an offence of wrong doing. Having left the range of sight, [if] he sees [one or other division of the army] again and again, there is an offence of wrong doing.” (BD II 376). If the two subsequent rules were not related to parts of the army, these rules would be in contradiction to the non-offence clause.

400 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨201⟩

when it is not arrayed, and for one who is in doubt¹ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

But for one thinking it is not arrayed, [when it is not arrayed] there is no offence. [There also is no offence] for one standing in the monastery (*ārāma**) seeing it come to the place where he himself is standing, and [for one seeing it] coming [from] the opposite direction, in the case of an appropriate reason, in the case of disasters, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

These are the four constituent factors here: (i) going to see the army in array, (ii) seeing it elsewhere than in the allowed place, (iii) the absence of an appropriate reason or [118] of a disaster (= 9. constituent factors).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] sheep's wool (Niss 16 M),

but [the offence against] this [rule is] a fault according to common opinion (= 14. fault),

[is done with an] unwholesome [type of] thought (= 16. thought),

[with] three [types of] feeling (= 17. feelings).

The commentary on the rule about an army in array is finished.

[9. The commentary on the rule about staying with an army]

[49. Pāc M: *But there may be some reason for a bhikkhu to go to an army. [Then] that bhikkhu may stay with the army for two or three nights. If he should stay longer than that, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 62,18ff. = Vin IV 106,18ff.)]

In the ninth [rule] if longer than that (tato ce uttari, Pāt 62,20) means: longer than three nights. f—When the sun has set f on the fourth day, f—whether he stands or sits or lies with the army, even if he adopts any bodily posture in the sky by psychic power, it is indeed [an offence entailing] expiation. f

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. provenance) concerning the group of six (= 2. individuals) with respect to the subject matter “staying with the army for more than three days” (= 3. subject matter).

f—f Sp IV 859,1ff.

¹ Vin IV 105,29f. (BD II 376).

⟨202⟩*Suddhapācittiya 50 M*

401

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*). ⟨202⟩

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking it is more when it is less than three nights or for one who is in doubt² (= 6. [sorts of] *offence*).

There is no offence for one thinking it is less [when it is less than three nights], for one going out before dawn on the third night [but] staying again, for one who is ill or for one who is staying because of what may be done for one who is ill, for one obstructed by the army being besieged by an opposing army [or] by anyone,³ in the case of disasters, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) going beyond three days, (ii) the setting of the sun [when he stays with] the army,⁴ (iii) the absence of illness, etc.⁵ (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] sheep's wool (Niss 16 M).

The commentary on the rule about staying with an army is finished.

[10. The commentary on the rule about battlefields]

[50. Pāc M: *If while the bhikkhu is staying two or three nights with an army, he should go to a battlefield or to the counting of the forces or to an army array or to an army review, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 64,1ff. = Vin IV 107,26ff.)]

¹ Vin IV 106,27ff. (BD II 378).

² Vin IV 106,29f. (BD II 378).

³ In Kkh 202,3f. *patisenāruddhāya senāya, kenaci palibuddhassa* belong together, *senāya* as well as *kenaci* are agents to *palibuddhassa*. Vin III 107,1 runs as follows *senā vā patisenāya ruddhā hoti, kenaci palibuddho hoti*. “If the army becomes invested by the opposing army; if he comes to be taken possession of by something” (BD II 378).

⁴ This refers to the setting of the sun on the fourth day, see above, p. 400.

⁵ The “etc.” takes up all the additional situations listed in the non-offence clause above.

402 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨203⟩

^g—In the tenth [rule]: approaching again and again they fight here, [that is] a battlefield (*uyyodhikam*, Pāt 64.2). This is a name for a place of battle.

They know the counting of the forces¹ here (resolution of compound), [that is] the counting of the forces (*balaggam*, Pāt 64.3). The meaning is: the place for counting the forces.

The array of the army (resolution of compound), [that is] army array (*senābyūham*, Pāt 64.3). This is a name for the abode of the army.^{—g}

The reviewing of the army (resolution of compound) [that is] an army review (*anīka-dassanam*, Pāt 64.3).

“Army” (*anikam*) means: in accordance with this characteristic: h—“An elephant has twelve men; a horse, three men; a chariot, four men”;^{—h} three elephants are the smallest elephant army; exactly the same manner applies to horse armies and chariot armies. But four men with weapons in their hands are the smallest infantry army. For one going to see any one among these, there is [an offence of] wrong doing in each footstep. For one seeing while standing in the range of sight, there is [an offence entailing] expiation. But having left [that] range [of sight], for [him], seeing it again and again, there is [an offence entailing] expiation in each action.ⁱ—The remainder is to be understood exactly in the manner stated in the rule about an army in array (Pāc 48 M),^{—i} but here there ⟨203⟩ is indeed no division of offences.²

The commentary on the rule about battlefields is finished.

The section about naked ascetics, the fifth.

[f. The section about drinking alcoholic drinks]

[i. The commentary on the rule about drinking alcoholic drinks]

[51. Pāc M: *In drinking alcoholic drinks made of grains or alcoholic drinks made of fruits [or flowers], there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 64.8 = Vin IV 110,13)]

^{g—g}Sp IV 859,8–13

^{h—h}Vin IV 105,16f.

^{i—i}Sp IV 859,15f.

¹ *balagga*; *agga*, Skt *agra* is used in the sense of “total in accounting” or “total sum” in the Arthaśāstra (NWS s.v. *agra*).

² Since the monk is already staying with the army, the differentiation of offences depending on the manner in which a bhikkhu happens to see the army does not apply here.

⟨203⟩

Suddhapācittiya 51 M

403

In the first [rule]¹ of the section about drinking alcoholic drinks, here [i.e. in the compound], *in drinking alcoholic drinks made of grains or alcoholic drinks made of fruits [or flowers]* (*surāmerayapāne*, Pāt 64,8), “an alcoholic drink made of grains” (*surā*) is an intoxicant (*majja*)² made from crushed seeds, etc.; “an alcoholic drink made of fruits [or flowers]” (*meraya*) is a drink of distilled spirits (*āsava*) made from flowers, etc. There is [an offence entailing] expiation in each action for one drinking either of these starting from [a quantity as small as] a seed, even [a quantity held on] the tip of [a blade of] kusa grass.

[This rule] was prescribed at Kosambi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Elder Sāgata (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “drinking intoxicants” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.³ It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking it is an intoxicant when it is not an intoxicant, and for one who is in doubt⁴ (= 6. *[sorts of] offence*).

There is no offence for one who thinks it is not an intoxicant [when it is not an intoxicant], for one drinking a non-intoxicant with the colour, smell, and taste of an intoxicant, be it a salted sour gruel (*loñasovīraka*) or a fermented liquid⁵ (*sutta*);⁶ they cook curry, etc., throwing

¹ Regarding the position of this rule in the sequence of the Pātimokkha, see von Hinüber 1999: 45; for the relation to a passage in the Mahāvagga, see von Hinüber 1999: 57.

² *majja* is the overriding notion.

³ Vin IV 110,19f. (*BD* II 385).

⁴ Vin IV 110,21f. (*BD* II 385f.).

⁵ *sutta*, Skt *sukta* or *śukta* is a fermented liquid (*NWS* s.v. *śukta*), or each sour drink made by fermentation with plant substances (*pw* s.v. *śuktā*, 4a).

⁶ Sp IV 860,3f.: *amajjañ ca hoti majjavāññāñ majjagandhañ majjharaśan ti* (Vin IV 110,23f.) *loñasovīrakanā vā suttanā vā hoti*. “And a non-intoxicant having the colour of an intoxicant, having the smell of an intoxicant, having the taste of an intoxicant means: a salty sour gruel or a fermented liquid.” This passage from Sp shows that *loñasovīraka* and *sutta*, neither of which are mentioned in the non-offence clause of the Vinaya (Vin IV 110,23–26), are listed as an explanation of the non-intoxicant that has the smell, colour, and

404

Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation ⟨203⟩

in a little intoxicant to cause it to take the flavour, in these cookings of curry [119], etc. [there is no offence]; from the juice of myrobalan, etc., they make non-intoxicant *ariṭṭha*¹ that is like an intoxicant, [there is no offence] for one drinking that, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the two constituent factors here: (i) being an intoxicant, (ii) and the drinking of it (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] sheep's wool (Niss 16 M),

but [the offence against] this [rule is] a fault according to common opinion (= 14. *fault*),

[is done with an] an unwholesome [type of] thought (= 16. *thought*),
[with] three [types of] feeling (= 17. *feelings*).

The commentary on the rule about drinking alcoholic drinks is finished.

[2. The commentary on the rule about tickling with fingers]

[52. Pāc M: *In tickling with fingers there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 64,10 = Vin IV 111,7)]

j-In the second [rule], *in tickling with fingers* (*aṅgulipatodake*, Pāt 64,10) means: it is called touching the arm-pits, etc., with the fingers. j And moreover, it is [an offence entailing] expiation for one touching an ordained [person] with any part of the body, with the intention of [causing] laughter.

j-j Sp IV 860,20f.

taste of an intoxicant. We translate the Kkh text accordingly. Kkh-nṭ 402,23f.: *loṇasovīrakam vā suttam vā ti* (Kkh 203,13) *ime dve anekehi bhesajjehi abhisarīkhatā āsavavisesā*. “These two, salted sour gruel or *sutta*, are special spirituous drinks concocted with many medicines.” Salted sour gruel is defined in various texts, Sp II 478,26–79,10 (see the summary in BD I 149, n. 3); Vv-a 99,21–24 (VS 146), etc.

¹ Skt *ariṣṭa*, used for liquor, medicinal wine, but also for vegetable drugs or elixirs, NWS s.v. As the explanation in Sp IV 860,10f. shows, *ariṭṭha* can be an intoxicant or a non-intoxicant.

⟨204⟩

Suddhapācittiya 53 M

405

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “[causing to] laugh by tickling with ⟨204⟩ fingers” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ There is a triple [offence of] wrong doing in respect of someone who is unordained.² But here, even a bhikkhunī for a bhikkhu, and a bhikkhu for a bhikkhunī, [counts as] unordained indeed. Under all circumstances it is only [an offence of] wrong doing in respect of things attached to the body,³ etc.⁴ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one who has no intention of [causing] laughter, for one touching when there is something to be done, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

These are the two constituent factors here: (i) the intention of [causing] laughter, (ii) touching the body of an ordained [person] with [one's own] body (= 9. constituent factors).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are exactly the same as for the first [rule entailing] defeat (Pāt 1 M).

The commentary on the rule about tickling with fingers is finished.

[3. The commentary on the rule about sporting]

[53. Pāc M: *In sporting in the water there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*⁵

(Pāt 64,12 = Vin IV 112,22)]

In the third [rule], ^{k-}*in sporting in the water (udake hasadhamme,* Pāt 64,12) is called playing in water (*udaka-kīlā*).^{-k} Therefore, whatever

^{k-}^kSp IV 860,29–61,1

¹ Vin IV 111,10ff. (BD II 388).

² Vin IV 111,23–26 (BD II 388).

³ Vin IV 111,13–17, 19–22 (BD II 388).

⁴ The “etc.” takes up the cases with *nissaggiya* mentioned in between the *kāya-paṭibaddha* cases.

⁵ Kkh 204,10 “pācittiyame pācittiyam” is to be corrected to “pācittiyam”.

406 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨204⟩

bhikkhu — going only in water that is above the ankles with the intention of sporting — dives or surfaces, for him ^a—going down for the sake of diving, etc., there is [an offence of] wrong doing in a hand movement [and] in a foot movement. In diving and surfacing there is [an offence entailing] expiation in each action. Having dived, for him going just beneath the water [there is an offence entailing expiation] in respect of each movement of [his] hands and feet,¹ or for him swimming,¹ ^b—with whatever limb he swims, there is [an offence entailing] expiation in each action of each of them.^{—b}

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of seventeen bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “playing in water” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.² It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one who thinks it is sporting when it is not sporting in the water, or for one who is in doubt.³ Similarly, it is [an offence of] wrong doing for one playing with a boat;⁴ for one striking the water with the hand or foot or with a piece of wood or a potsherd;⁵ for one

^a—^a ≠ Sp IV 861,3–6 ^b—^b Sp IV 861,8f.

¹ In the Word Analysis of this rule three verbs are mentioned: diving (*nimmujjati*), surfacing (*ummujjati*), and swimming (*palavati*; Vin IV 112,24). Sp (IV 861,6–9) in explaining *palavati* states: *palavatī* (v.l. *plavatī*) *ti tarati. hatthehi tarantassa hatthavāre hatthavāre pācittiyam. pādesu pi es' eva nayo. yena yena arñgena tarati, tassa tassa payoge payoge pācittiyam.* “Swimming means: swimming (alternative verb). For one who swims with the hands there is an offence entailing expiation in each movement of [his] hands. Exactly this method [applies] also to the feet. With whatever limb he swims, there is an offence entailing expiation in each action of each of them.”

² Vin IV 112,26ff. (BD II 391).

³ Vin IV 112,33ff. (BD II 391).

⁴ Vin IV 112,29 (BD II 391). Sp IV 861,10f.: *nāvāya kīlatī ti* (Vin IV 112,29) *piyārittādīhi nāvāṇa pājento vā tīre ussādento vā nāvāya kīlati dukkaṭam.* “If he plays with a boat means: [it is] an offence of wrong doing [if] he plays with a boat navigating the boat with oars, rudders, etc., or pushing [it] onto the bank.”

⁵ Vin IV 112,30f. (BD II 391).

⟨205⟩*Suddhapācittiya 54 M*

407

| playing at throwing water in a bowl, or [throwing] rice-gruel, etc., or
|mud.¹ But it is suitable to cut a syllable for illustrating a meaning² (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

| There is no offence for one without an intention of [causing] laughter;
| for one who dives, having gone down when there is something to be
| done, etc.; for one going to the opposite shore; in the case of disasters;
| ⟨205⟩ and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

| These are the two constituent factors here: (i) [the water] being above
| the ankle, (ii) playing with the intention of [causing] laughter (= 9. constituent factors).

| The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are the same as for the first
| [rule entailing] defeat (Pār 1 M).

| The commentary on the rule about sporting is finished. [120]

| [4. The commentary on the rule about disrespect]

| [54. Pāc M: *In disrespect there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

| (Pāt 64.14 = Vin IV 113,7)]

| In the fourth [rule]³ in *disrespect* (*anādariye*, Pāt 64.14) means: in acting disrespectfully towards an individual or the Dhamma. Therefore, whatever bhikkhu, being spoken to by an ordained [person] about what has been prescribed,⁴ either because of desire not to do his bidding, or because of a desire not to practise the Dhamma, acts disrespectfully, for him there is [an offence entailing] expiation in that disrespect.

| [This rule] was prescribed at Kosambi (= 1. provenance) concerning Elder Channa (= 2. individual) with respect to the subject matter “acting disrespectfully” (= 3. subject matter).

| [The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. prescription).

| It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. command).

¹ The list in the Vinaya is a little longer, adding milk, butter-milk, dye-stuff, and urine (Vin IV 112,32, BD II 391). This is indicated here by “rice-gruel, etc.”

² This option is not mentioned in the Vinaya. For details, see Appendix 36.

³ For a comparison of this rule with one in Pāṇī, see von Hintüber 1999: 34.

⁴ For a quotation from this rule in the Mahāvagga, see von Hintüber 1999: 62.

¹⁴ Kkh 205.8 *paññattena* with v.l. *paññatte*.

408 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* 〈205〉

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ There is a triple [offence of] wrong doing in respect of one who is unordained.² Even in the disrespect of one being spoken to by about what has not been prescribed, in the manner of c—“This is not conducive to the higher life”,^{3-c} etc., there is indeed [an offence of] wrong doing⁴ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

But for one, having accepted the teaching which has been handed down by tradition, saying, d—“Thus are our teachers’ teaching [and] interrogation”,^{-d} and for one who is insane, etc., there is no offence (= 7. non-offence).

These are the two constituent factors here: (i) the speech of an ordained [person] about what has been prescribed, (ii) acting disrespectfully (= 9. constituent factors).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] taking what is not given (Pār 2 M),

but [the offence against] this [rule is done with] an unpleasant [type of] feeling (= 17. *feeling*).

The commentary on the rule about disrespect is finished.

[5. The commentary on the rule about frightening]

[55. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should frighten a bhikkhu, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 64,16 = Vin IV 114,17)]

In the fifth [rule], *should frighten* (*bhiṃsāpeyya*, Pāt 64,16) means: should bring near forms, etc., in order to frighten, or should utter

c—c ≠ Vin IV 113,29ff. d—d Vin IV 114,4

¹ Vin IV 113,26ff. (BD II 394).

² Vin IV 114,1f. (BD II 394).

³ As the examples in Vin IV 113,28–14,1 show, the literal speech, “This is not conducive to the higher life”, etc., is the thought of the bhikkhu spoken to beforehand by an ordained or unordained person about something not prescribed in the text. In the sentence in Kkh, the use of the same case (two instrumentals) and the syntax (“...” *ti ādinā nayena apaññattena vuccamānassa*) could lead to the assumption that the direct speech illuminates the *apaññattena*. From the point of view of content, however, this cannot be the case.

⁴ Vin IV 113,28–14,1 (BD II 394).

⟨206⟩*Suddhapācittiya 56 M*

409

frightening sayings. Whether he is frightened or not, there is [an offence entailing] expiation for the other one. ⟨206⟩

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “frightening” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ There is a triple [offence of] wrong doing in respect of one who is unordained² (= 6. *[sorts of] offence*).

There is no offence for one acting thus when not wishing to frighten, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the two constituent factors here: (i) being ordained, (ii) the effort because of the desire to frighten in the ranges of sight and hearing (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. *[sorts of] origin*), etc., are exactly the same as for the previous rule (Pāc 54 M).

The commentary on the rule about frightening is finished.

[6. The commentary on the rule about fires]

[56. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu [who is] not ill should kindle a fire or have one kindled, looking to be warmed [by it], unless [there is] an appropriate reason, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 64,19ff. = Vin IV 115,7ff.)]

In the sixth [rule] *looking to be warmed* (*visibbanāpekkho*, Pāt 64,19) means: desiring to be heated.

Should kindle (*samādaheyya*, Pāt 64,20) means: should light.

Unless [*there is*] *an appropriate reason* (*aññatra tathārūpappaccayā*, Pāt 64,20f.) means: without a reason such as lighting a lamp or making a fire in respect of cooking in bowls, etc. There, this is the regulation: for one kindling [the fire] himself, ^ebeginning with arranging two pieces of

^eeSp IV 862,13f.

¹Vin IV 114,27ff. (BD II 396f.).

²Vin IV 114,32–15,2 (BD II 397).

410 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨207⟩

wood [for kindling], as long as a flame does not spring forth, for so long there is [an offence of] wrong doing in all actions;^e there is [an offence entailing] expiation in the springing forth of the fire. There is [an offence of] wrong doing for the one having the fire kindled by command. There is only a single [offence entailing] expiation, even if it is kindled many times by one [who was] ordered [only] once.

[This rule] was prescribed in the Bhagga [country] (= 1. *provenance*) concerning many bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “warming themselves having kindled a fire” (= 3. *subject matter*).

These, [i.e.] “not ill” (*agilāno*) [and] “unless [there is] an appropriate reason” (*aññatratathārūpappaccayā*), are the two supplementary prescriptions (*anupaññatti*) here (i.e. in Pāc 56 M).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking he is not ill when he is ill, or for one who is in doubt;² similarly for one throwing up a fire-brand,³ and for one having thrown it up unextinguished,⁴ placing it in the proper place.⁴
^g–But it is [an offence entailing] expiation for one burning it when extinguished^{–g} (= 6. [sorts of] *offence*).

There is no offence for one thinking he is ill when he is ill, [121] for one warming himself [at] one made by another or [at] flameless embers, ⟨207⟩ in the event of an appropriate reason such as lighting a lamp, in the bathhouse, etc., in the case of disasters, and for one who is insane (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the four constituent factors here: (i) not being ill, (ii) the absence of a reason for [its] allowance, (iii) there being a desire to warm oneself, (iv) the kindling (= 9. *constituent factors*).

^{f–f}Sp IV 862,18 ^{g–g}≠ Sp IV 862,19f.

¹ Vin IV 116,19–22 (BD II 400).

² Vin IV 116,23f. (BD II 400).

³ Vin IV 116,22 (BD II 400).

⁴ This case is not listed in the Vinaya, but comes up in Sp IV 862,18ff. in connection with the explanation of the preceding case (n. 1569).

⟨207⟩

Suddhapācittiya 57 M

411

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are to be understood in exactly the manner stated in [the rule about] a go-between (Sgh 5 M).

The commentary on the rule about fires is finished.

[7. The commentary on the rule about bathing]

[57. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should bathe at intervals of less than a fortnight, unless [there is] a [proper] occasion, there is [an offence entailing] expiation. There, this is a [proper] occasion: the remaining month and a half of the hot season, [and] the first month of the rainy season, these two and a half months are the occasion of hot weather; an occasion of fever; an occasion of illness; an occasion of work; an occasion of going on a journey; an occasion of wind and rain. This is a [proper] occasion there.*

(Pāt 66,2–7 = Vin IV 119,4–9)]

In the seventh [rule],¹ *should bathe* (*nahāyeyya*, Pāt 66,2) means: whatever bhikkhu in the Middle Country — when half a month from the day of his [last] bathing is not complete, unless [there is] a [proper] occasion, [thinking], “I shall bathe” — prepares powder or mud, from then on ^h—there is [an offence of] wrong doing for him in all actions.^{—h} There is [an offence entailing] expiation at the end of bathing.

Among the occasions, even merely sweeping one’s cell is *an occasion of work* (*kammasamayo*, Pāt 66,5); for one wishing to go half a league (*yojana**), going, or having gone, [it is] *an occasion of going on a journey* (*addhānagamanasamayo*, Pāt 66,6); for one sprinkled by the dusty wind or when two or three drops of water have fallen on his body, it is to be understood as *an occasion of wind and rain* (*vātavuṭthisamayo*, Pāt 66,6). The remainder is entirely clear.

[This rule] is prescribed at Rājagaha (= 1. *provenance*) concerning many bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “bathing not knowing the limit” (= 3. *subject matter*).

^h—hSp IV 862,28

¹ For a connection between this rule and a regulation in the Mahāvagga (Vin I 197,35f.), see von Hinüber 1999: 63.

412

Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation ⟨208⟩

This, [i.e.] “unless [there is] a [proper] occasion” (*aññatram samayo*, Pāt 66,2f.) is the sixfold supplementary prescription (*anupaññatti*) here (i.e. in Pāc 57 M).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with an order (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking it is less when it is more than half a month, or for one who is in doubt² (= 6. [sorts of] *offence*).

There is no offence for one thinking it is more; or for one bathing on a [proper] occasion; or for one who — going to the opposite shore of a river, having dug sand — bathes even in the holes that have been made [by him thus]; for everyone in the border districts; in the case of disasters; and for one who is insane (= 7. *non-offence*) ⟨208⟩

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) the Middle Country, (ii) bathing after less than half a month, (iii) the absence of occasions or of going to the opposite shore, or of disasters (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., are exactly the same as for [the rule about] sheep's wool (Niss 16 M).

The commentary on the rule about bathing is finished.

[8. The commentary on the rule about discolouring]

[58. Pāc M: *One or other disfigurement of the three disfigurements is to be applied by a bhikkhu having obtained a new robe: blue or mud[-colour] or dark brown. If a bhikkhu should use a new robe without applying one or other disfigurement of the three disfigurements, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 66,9–13 = Vin IV 120,21–25)]

In the eighth [rule], ⁱ—“he has obtained” (*alabhi*) means: obtaining (*labho*); obtaining (*labho*) indeed is obtainment (*lābho*). What has been obtained? A robe. What sort? A new one. Thus when *nava-cīvara-lābhena* (“by [a bhikkhu] having obtained a new robe”) should be said,

ⁱ—Sp IV 863,6–11

¹ Vin IV 119,26ff. (BD II 405).

² Vin IV 119,28ff. (BD II 405).

<208>

Suddhapācittiya 58 M

413

|not having elided the nasal sound (i.e. *m* in *navam*), *navam cīvara-lābhena* (Pāt 66,9 “a new one, by [a bhikkhu] having acquired a robe”) is said. The meaning is: “by [a bhikkhu] having obtained a new robe” (*paṭiladdha-nava-cīvarena*). The word *pana* (Pāt 66,9), standing in the middle [between] the two words is a mere particle.

|By a bhikkhu (*bhikkhunā*, Pāt 66,9) means: by whom it has been obtained, the showing of him;¹ the remainder is entirely clear from the [point of view of] the meaning of the words. But this is the regulation here: Having obtained a robe which is fit for an inner garment (*nivāsana*) and an outer garment (*pārupana*), having applied¹ in some place or other of it when [its] dyeing is finished a legalizing dot (*kappabindu*) of the size of one or other of the roundel of a peacock’s eye or the back of a *maṅgula* fish (?),² with bronze green or lead green or mud colour or with some black or other, that robe is to be used. For one using [the robe], not having applied [the legalizing dot],³ there is [an offence entailing] expiation.

|[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning many bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “not knowing their own robes” (= 3. *subject matter*).

|[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

|It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

|There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.⁴ It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking it is not applied when it is applied, or for one who is in doubt⁵ (= 6. [sorts of] offence). [**I22**]

|There is no offence for one thinking it is applied [when it is applied]; if the legalizing [dot]⁶ is destroyed; if the spot [on the robe] marked by

¹ *ādiyitvā* from *ādiyati*. This verb has constantly been translated as “to take” by IBH which makes her translation of this rule problematic.

² For this, see Kkh 94,15ff.; above, p. 193.

³ This refers to the *kappa-bindu* and, as is clear from Sp IV 863,18, the disfigurement (*dubbañña-karaṇa*) mentioned in the rule is understood as referring to the *kappa-bindu*.

⁴ Vin IV 121,3–5 (BD II 408).

⁵ Vin IV 121,4f. (BD II 408).

⁶ *kappo* is to be understood as a short form for *kappa-bindu*. See above, p. 193, n. 1. See also Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II 1001. The present rule deals with the

414 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* **〈209〉**

the legalizing [dot] becomes worn out; if a [fabric] not marked by a legalizing [dot] is sewn together with [a robe] marked by a legalizing [dot]; for one wearing [the robe] after a patch, a braiding or a binding has been mounted on it; **〈209〉** and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) not being marked by a legalizing [dot]¹ of a robe of the stated sort, (ii) the robe not having been destroyed,² etc., (iii) an inner garment (*nivāsana*) or an outer garment (*pārupana*) (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. *[sorts of] origin*), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] sheep's wool (Niss 16 M),

but [the offence against] this [rule originates in] activity and inactivity (= 11. *activity*).

The commentary on the rule about discolouring is finished.

[9. The commentary on the rule about assigning]

[59. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu, having personally assigned a robe to a bhikkhu or a bhikkhunī or a female probationer or a male novice or a female novice, should [then] use that [robe] when [it] has not been*

application of a disfigurement on a robe, which is specified as the legalizing dot (*kappa-bindu*). The non-offence case *kappo naṭṭho hoti* (Vin IV 121,8) is translated by IBH as “if what is allowable becomes destroyed” (BD II 409). Since the robe is what is allowable or lawful if the *kappa-bindu* has been applied, IBH’s translation would mean that the robe is destroyed, which does not make sense.

¹ Kkh 209,2 *akata-kappakatā* with variant ^o*kappatā* (C^e). Usually the constituent factors are listed as abstract nouns ending in ^o*tā*. This makes it highly likely that the reading of the Sinhalese edition, *akata-kappatā* (Kkh 209 n. 1), is the correct one. If the Burmese reading is accepted, the compound will have to be separated into *akata-kappaka-tā*, not *akata-kappa-katā*. But whereas *kappa* is known to be used in short for *kappa-bindu*, *kappaka* is not known in this function. Since the constituent factors for a rule are also listed in several subcommentaries, borrowed from Kkh, there is further evidence for this reading, given that Sp-ṭ and Vmv read *akata-kappatā* in the Burmese and Srilankan editions (Sp-ṭ B^e III 82,5; Vmv B^e II 44,17f.; C^e 330,13).

² Kkh 209,2 *na naṭṭha-cīvarādītā* without variants (not used elsewhere; this construction is not expected, since the negation of a substantive is regularly formed with the prefixed *a-/an-*); Sp-ṭ B^e III 82,5; Vmv B^e II 44,18; C^e 330,13 read *a-naṭṭha-cīvarādītā*.

⟨209⟩

Suddhapācittiya 59 M

415

formally given up [by the one to whom it was assigned],¹ there is [an offence entailing] expiation.

(Pāt 66,15ff. = Vin IV 121,30–33)]

In the ninth [rule], *having assigned* (*vikappetvā*, Pāt 66,17) means: here there are j two [types of] assignment: (1) “assignment in [someone’s] presence” (*sammukhā-vikappanā*) and (2) “assignment in [someone’s] absence” (*parammukhā-vikappanā*).

(1) How is there “assignment in [someone’s] presence”?

(a) Knowing [whether] there is one robe or many, and whether they are stored or not stored, having said, “This robe” or “These robes” or “That robe” or “Those robes”, [a bhikkhu] must say, “I formally assign [it] to you.” This is one [type of] “assignment in [someone’s] presence”.² With that much it is suitable to deposit [the robe], but it is not suitable to use [it] or to give [it] away or formally take possession of [it].³ But [if the person to whom the robe was assigned] says, k—“Use my property [or] my properties or give [them] away or do with [them] according to your wish”,^{4–k}

j-j Sp III 648,3–49,8 k-k ≠ Vin IV 122,15f.

¹ Vin IV 121,32 (BD II 411), etc., *apaccuddhārakam* without v.l. Kkh lists this rule with the reading *appaccuddhāraṇam* with the v.l. °*dhārakam*. According to the commentary, an object may be deposited if it has been formally assigned (*vikappeti*) to someone else. If the person to whom the object had been formally assigned gives it up (*paccuddharati*), the one who assigned it to him is allowed to use it, give it away, or formally take possession of it. In the present rule the bhikkhu who assigns the robe to someone else also uses it, though it is an *appaccuddhāraka*, “a [robe] not formally given up”. Thus the reading *apaccuddhārakam* is the more likely variant here.

² This corresponds exactly to what is described in the Word Analysis concerning the word *vikappanam* (Vin IV 122,10f., BD II 412).

³ It is clear from this description that by assigning a robe, a bhikkhu is able to deposit robes without violating robe rules, especially Niss 1 M, allowing an extra robe for at most ten days.

⁴ The formula to be spoken by the second person is not given in the Vinaya. Nevertheless, it is clear from the Vinaya that the recipient of the assignment has to somehow give the one who assigns the robe permission to still use the robe because in the Word Analysis of the Vinaya, part of the explanation of the word *apaccuddhārakam* (“[a robe] not formally given up”) is *tassa vā adinnam* (Vin IV 122,17, BD II 412), “[the robe is] not given to him (that is, to the first bhikkhu).”

416 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨209⟩

this is called “formally giving up” (*paccuddhāra*).¹ From then on, use, etc., are suitable.²

(b) ³Another method⁴ [of “assignment in someone’s presence” is this]: knowing in just the same way [as previously stated] whether there is one robe or many, and whether they are stored or not stored, having said, in the presence of that very bhikkhu,⁵ “This robe” or “These robes”

¹ This is the speech of the second person involved, that is, of the person to whom the robe is assigned. The second person obviously permits the bhikkhu to also use the robe which the latter had just assigned to him. Thus, this speech makes the assigned robe “one formally given up” (*paccuddhāraka*), and allows the bhikkhu to use it. As is evident from the Pātimokha rule itself, the bhikkhu who assigns a robe commits an offence entailing expiation only if he uses that same robe, when it is *apaccuddhāraka* “not formally given up [by the person to whom it is assigned]”.

² The commentary makes clear that in order to enable both individuals — the one who assigns the robe and the one to whom it is assigned — to use this same robe, two acts are necessary: (1) assignment (*vikappana*) of a robe by a bhikkhu to a second person; (2) formal giving up (*paccuddharana*) of the ownership claim by the second person whom the robe was assigned to. If only the first act has been carried out, the robe can be deposited, but not used. Thānissaro (2007: I 451ff.), because of the reciprocal relation expressed by this rule, renders *vikappeti* (“to assign”) as “to place under shared ownership”. This is problematic, however, insofar as *vikappana* solely describes the first act, which only allows the depositing. The complete reciprocal relationship is only made possible by both, step one (*vikappana*) and step two (*paccuddharana*).

³ Kkh 209,19. With *aparo nayo* a new paragraph should start in the edition.

⁴ For a discussion of this, see Appendix 37.

⁵ *tass’ eva bhikkhu* (Kkh 209,20f.), this can only refer to one of the two people involved in the previous example. Though no subjects are mentioned there, both most probably are bhikkhus. There are two possibilities for this second example: either the bhikkhu who assigned a robe to another bhikkhu makes a second assignment to some third monastic (one of the five groups of monastics) in the presence of the same person as in the case of his first assignment; or, the one to whom the robe was assigned makes this assignment for one of the five monastics in the presence of the bhikkhu who had assigned the robe to him. The response of the second person to the one who assigned the robe clearly shows that the second person permits the first person to use the robe that was just assigned to some third monastic. The second person, therefore, directly acts on behalf of this third party. The second option is the more probable. It could be a procedure in case the bhikkhu to whom the robe was assigned does not need it or does not want it, and he therefore transfers it to a

or “That robe” or “Those robes”, having taken the name of one among the five co-religionists, someone or other approved by himself, [the bhikkhu] must say, “I formally assign [it] to the bhikkhu Tissa”, or “I formally assign [it] to the bhikkhunī Tissā, [or] ... to the trainee, [or] ... to the male novice [or] ... to the female novice Tissā.”¹ This is one more “assignment in [someone’s] presence”. With that much it is suitable to deposit it, [but] not even one [possibility] among use, etc., is suitable. But [if] that bhikkhu said, “Use this property of the bhikkhu Tissa”, ... “the property of the female novice Tissā” or “Give [it] away” or “Do with [it] according to ⟨210⟩ your wish”; this is called “formally giving up” (*paccuddhāra*). From then on, use, etc., are suitable.²

(2) How is there “assignment in [someone’s] absence” (*parammukhā-vikappanā*)? Knowing [whether] there is one robe or many, and whether they are stored or not stored, having said, “This robe” or “These robes” or “That robe” or “Those robes”, [the bhikkhu who assigns to the bhikkhu who acts as a witness] must say,³ “I give [it] to you for the sake of formally assigning [it].” [The witness] has to address [the bhikkhu], “Who is your friend or intimate acquaintance?” Then the other one (i.e. the bhikkhu who assigned it) must say exactly according to the previous manner, “The bhikkhu Tissa” [or] ... “The female novice Tissā.” Again, the bhikkhu [who is the witness] must say, “I give [it] to the bhikkhu Tissa” [or] ... “I give [it] to the female novice Tissā.”⁴ [123] This is

third party — namely to someone approved by him.

¹ Though the one to whom the robe is assigned is not the same as the one to whom the bhikkhu speaks, it is obvious from the wording of the response that the bhikkhu spoken to is not a witness (see the text below for the wording to be used by a witness, see Appendix 37).

² This second case of “assignment in [someone’s] presence” describes the case that someone (possibly the person to whom the robe was just assigned), now makes an assignment in the presence of that very bhikkhu (*tass’ eva bhikkhuno*, Kkh 209,20f.; see above, pp. 416f., n. 5) who had assigned the robe before, mentioning another member of the five classes of monastics as a user of the robe, and then permitting the bhikkhu who originally assigned the robe to use the property of bhikkhu X, bhikkhunī Y, etc.

³ The witness is identified as a bhikkhu later in this dialogue (Kkh 210,11).

⁴ This dialogue is reminiscent of the one in the Word Analysis of the Vinaya (Vin IV 122,12–16, BD II 412).

418 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨210⟩

“assignment in [someone’s] absence”. With that much [it] is suitable to deposit [the robe(s), but] not even one [possibility] among use, etc., is suitable. But [if] that bhikkhu [who is the witness] says exactly in the manner stated in the second “assignment in [someone’s] presence”, “Use the property of so-and-so” or “Give [it] away” or “Do with [it] according to your wish”, this is called “formally giving up” (*paccuddhāra*). From then on, use, etc., are suitable.”^{1-j} The same method applies to the assignment of bowls.²

Thus by whatsoever assignment among the two [types of] assignment having assigned a robe to someone or other among the five co-religionists, there is [an offence entailing] expiation for him using [it], either [when] the formal giving up has not been carried out [by the one to whom it is assigned] in accordance with the stated method, or [when] he has not taken [it] on trust for him³ together with⁴ whom the legal procedure (*vinaya-kamma*) has been carried out.⁵

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Upananda (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “using something not formally given up [by the one to whom it was assigned]” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.⁶ But for one formally

¹ Kkh 210,14 ends this long portion with *ti*, indicating that this text is quoted from another text. It stems from the commentary on Niss 1 M in Sp III 648,3–49,8.

² Thānissaro (2007: I 454) hints at the fact that, aside from this statement, this is not discussed for bowls anywhere else.

³ That is, the one to whom he has assigned it. For if the one who assigns it to the other one has an “on trust” relationship, formally giving up is no longer necessary. See Thānissaro 2007: I 454.

⁴ Kkh 210,18: *yena vinayakammāna katañ* is explained by *yena saddhiñ vinayakammāna katañ* (Sp-ṭ III 82,10f.; Kkh-nṭ 406,28).

⁵ Here, Kkh takes up the word explanation from the Word Analysis of the Vinaya (IV 122,17f.): *apaccuddhārakañ* (Vin IV 121,32) *nāma tassa vā adinnam tassa vā avissāento paribhuñjati, āpatti pācittiyassa*. “Not having been formally given up means: it is not given to him, or he uses it not on trust for him, [that is] an offence entailing expiation.”

⁶ Vin IV 122,19ff. (BD II 412f.).

taking possession of it or giving it away there is [an offence of] wrong doing.¹ Similarly, for one thinking it was not formally given up when it was formally given up or for one who is in doubt² (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

But for one thinking it was formally given up [when it was formally given up], for one using [it] on trust,³ and for one who is insane, etc., there is no offence (= 7. non-offence).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) the non-formal giving up of [something] assigned [to someone] by himself,⁴ (ii) [it] being a robe fit for assignment, (iii) the use (= 9. constituent factors).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are exactly the same as for the first *kathina* [rule] (Niss 1 M),

but [the offence against] this [rule originates in] activity and inactivity (= 11. activity).

The commentary on the rule about assigning is finished. ⟨211⟩

[10. The commentary on the rule about hiding]

[60. Pāc M: If any bhikkhu should hide or have hidden a bhikkhu's bowl or robe or sitting [cloth] or needle case or waistband, even if intending a joke, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.

(Pāt 66,20ff. = Vin IV 123,22ff.)]

In the tenth [rule], *bowl* (*pattam*, Pāt 66,20) means: one fit for formally taking possession of.⁵

Robe (*cīvaraṁ*, Pāt 66,20) means: one fit for assigning.

Sitting [cloth] (*nisīdanam*, Pāt 66,20f.) is called one with a fringe.^{–k'}

^{–k' –k'} Vin IV 123,21

¹ Vin IV 122,22 (BD II 413).

² Vin IV 122,22ff. (BD II 413).

³ These two elements are represented in Vin IV 122,26 by *so vā deti tassa vā vissāsento paribhuñjati* “he (that is, the one whom it was assigned to) gives [it], or he uses it, putting his trust in him.”

⁴ What is meant is that the person to whom something has been assigned by a bhikkhu, does not formally give it up.

⁵ *adhitṭhānupagam*; that is the bowl fulfills all the preconditions concerning size and material required for a bowl to be allowed to be taken possession of formally by a bhikkhu.

420

Bhikkhupātimokkha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation

⟨211⟩

Needle-case (*sūcigharam*, Pāt 66,21) is with a needle or without a needle.

Waist-band (*kāyabandhanam*, Pāt 66,21) is a strip of cloth (*paṭṭikā*) or a “pig-tail” (*sūkarantaka*).¹

^a—*Should hide* (*apanidheyya*, Pāt 66,21) means: having taken it away should deposit.^{—a}

Intending a joke (*hasāpekkho*, Pāt 66,22) means: having the intention of [making] a joke.

[*An offence entailing*] expiation (*pācittiyam*, Pāt 66,22) means: there is [an offence entailing] expiation for one hiding it himself. There is [an offence of] wrong doing because of the order for the one ordering another. When it has been hidden by him (i.e. by the one ordered to hide it), there is [an offence entailing] expiation for the other (i.e. the one who has ordered).

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatti (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “hiding” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.² There is a triple [offence of] wrong doing in respect of one who is unordained.³ Apart from the bowl, etc., of the stated kinds, it is only [an offence of] wrong doing for one hiding another requisite which is the property of an ordained or unordained [person]⁴ (= 6. [sorts of] *offence*).

There is no offence for one putting in order what is badly arranged, for one putting in order [thinking], “Having given a talk on the Doctrine, I will give it back”, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the two constituent factors here: (i) the hiding of bowls, etc., that are property of an ordained [person], (ii) there being a desire to annoy or the intention to joke (= 9. *constituent factors*).

^a—^aSp IV 864,11f.

¹ These are the two types of belt allowed in the Vinaya; see Gräfe 1974: 82f.

² Vin IV 123,29–33 (BD II 415).

³ Vin IV 123,37–24,2 (BD II 415f.).

⁴ Vin IV 123,33–37 (BD II 415).

⟨212⟩*Suddhapācittiya 61 M*

421

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] taking what is not given (Pār 2 M).

The commentary on the rule about hiding is finished.

The section about drinking alcoholic drinks, the sixth ⟨212⟩

[g. The section about living beings]

[i. The commentary on the rule about intentionally]

[61. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should intentionally deprive a living being of life, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 68,3f. = Vin IV 124,26f.)]

In the first [rule]¹ of the section about living beings, *living being* (≠ *pāṇo*)², means: ^ba living animal is intended.^{-b} There is indeed [an offence entailing] expiation ^bfor one killing it whether [it is] small or large; ^bc⁻but in the case of a large one, the demerit is large because of the largeness of the undertaking.^{-c} [124]

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Elder Udāyi (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “depriving a living being of life” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is [an offence of] wrong doing for one who is in doubt as to whether it is a living being, for one who thinks it is a living being when it is not a living being, or for one who is in doubt³ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

It is no offence for one who thinks it is not a living being [when it is or is not a living being],⁴ if it is unintentional (*asañcicca*), for one not knowing, for one not intending death, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

^{b-b}Sp IV 864,27f. ^{c-c}Sp IV 864,29f.

¹ For the relationship between this rule and Pār 3, see von Hinüber 1999: 44; for the relationship with a rule in the Mahāvagga (Vin I 191,16f.), see von Hinüber 1999: 56.

² Kkh 212, n. 2, C^e has the variant *pāṇan* which is the form to be expected (Pāt 68,3: *pāṇam*).

³ Vin IV 125,1ff. (BD III 2).

⁴ Vin IV 125,2f.4 (BD III 2).

422

Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation ⟨213⟩

The remainder is exactly of the manner stated in respect of [the rule about] a human being (Pāc 3 M).

The commentary on the rule about intentionally is finished.

[2. The commentary on the rule about containing living beings]

[62. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should knowingly use water containing living beings, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 68,4f. = Vin IV 125,20f.)]

^d-In the second [rule]¹ *containing living beings* (*sappāṇakam*, Pāt 68,6) means: whatever living beings die from [a bhikkhu's] use [of the water], because of them [it is water] containing living beings. In fact, for one using such [water] knowingly there is [an offence entailing] expiation in each action.^{-d}

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “knowingly using water containing living beings” (= 3. *subject matter*).

The remainder here is to be understood in exactly the manner stated in the rule about pouring² (Pāc 20 M).

The commentary on the rule about containing living beings is finished.

[3. The commentary on the rule about re-opening]

[63. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should knowingly re-open for a renewed procedure a legal case which has been settled according to law, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 68,9f. = Vin IV 126,15f.)] ⟨213⟩

In the third [rule]³ ^e-*according to law* (*yathādhammaṁ*, Pāt 68,9) means: whatever law was pronounced to settle whatever legal case, by that rule.

^{d-d}Sp IV 865,5ff. ^{e-e}Sp IV 865,29ff.

¹ For the relationship between this rule and a regulation in the Cullavagga (Vin II 118,15), see von Hinüber 1999: 64.

² *siñcana-sikkhāpada*. In Kkh (166,21) Pāc 20 M bears the title *sappāṇaka-sikkhāpada*, which is the same title as that of the present rule (Pāc 62 M). This cross reference in Kkh (212,21) takes up the subject matter of Pāc 20 M which is expressed as *siñcana-vatthu* (Kkh 166,11), and from it forms the *sikkhāpada* name.

³ For the relationship between this rule and the Mahāvagga (Vin I 175,3f), see von Hinüber 1999: 62.

⟨213⟩

Suddhapācittiya 63 M

423

A legal case which has been settled (nihatādhikaranam, Pāt 68,9f)
means: a legal case that has been settled (resolution of compound);^e
the meaning is: it has been settled exactly according to the law stated by
the teacher in the Samathakkhandaka.¹ But we shall show this method of
settling [legal cases] in the [section about the] settlements of legal
cases.²

Should re-open for a renewed procedure (punakammāya ukkoṭeyya,
Pāt 68,10) means: going into the presence of this and that bhikkhu,
saying, ^f“The procedure was not carried out”, ^fetc., should [a bhikkhu]
re-open [it]. Should he not allow [a settled case] to [remain] established
according to the condition it was [established],³ there is [an offence
entailing] expiation for him acting thus. But whatever legal case has
been settled according to law, that is well settled indeed. If [a bhikkhu]
protests against a procedure which has been performed imperfectly, it is
to be performed⁴ having made this known. Otherwise the procedure is
disturbed, and there is an offence for those who performed it.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatti (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the
 group of six bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject
 matter “re-opening” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and
 bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is [an offence of] wrong doing for one who is in doubt when it
 is a lawful procedure, for one thinking it is a lawful procedure when it is
 an unlawful procedure, or for one who is in doubt⁵ (= 6. [sorts of]
 offence).

There is no offence for one who in both cases⁶ thinks it is an unlaw-
 ful procedure; for one knowing, “This procedure was done not according

^{f-f}Vin IV 126,5, 24

¹ The Samathakkhandaka is the fourth chapter of the Cullavagga (Vin II 73–104); it deals with the settlement of legal cases (*adhikarana*).

² Kkh 273ff., below, pp. 546ff.

³ *yathāṭhitabhāvena patiṭṭhātum na dadeyya*; Sp IV 865,28f.: *yathāpatiṭṭhitab-
 hāvena patiṭṭhātum na denti*.

⁴ That is to say, the same procedure is to be performed again, but this time
 correctly.

⁵ Vin IV 126,28, 30f. (BD III 6).

⁶ That is to say, whether it is or is not lawful. For this, see Vin IV 126,29f., 31f.
 (BD III 6).

424 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨214⟩

to the law”, or “[It was done] by an incomplete Saṅgha”, or “[It was done] against one not liable to a procedure”; and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) being settled according to law, (ii) the knowing, (iii) the re-opening (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] taking what is not given (Pār 2 M);

but [the offence against] this [rule is done with an] unpleasant [type of] feeling (= 17. *feeling*).

The commentary on the rule about re-opening is finished.

[4. The commentary on the rule about gross offences]

[64. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should knowingly conceal a bhikkhu's gross offence, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 68,13f. = Vin IV 127,29f.)]

In the fourth [rule]¹ *gross offence* (*dūṭhullam*, 68,13) means: an [offence against a rule] entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha is intended.² There is [an offence entailing] expiation for one concealing this [offence] having gained knowledge of it by some means or other. Even if, having given up [his] obligation³ [by saying], “I will not now [125] ⟨214⟩ tell this to any bhikkhu”, afterwards he tells [it], he will tell [it as one] having indeed⁴ committed [an offence entailing] expiation.⁵

¹ For this rule, see von Hinüber 1999: 65.

² The Suttavibhaṅga here mentions the Pārājika and the Saṅghādisesa offences in defining *dūṭhullā* (Vin IV 128,1f.). According to Kkh only the Saṅghādisesa offences are meant here, and Kkh-nt, in order to remove this contradiction, explains that the Pārājika offences are mentioned only by the “synopsis of the meanings” (*atthuddhāra-vasena*) in the Word Analysis. For this method of removing contradictions between various layers of the commentarial literature, but especially between the Pātimokha rules and the explanations in the Word Analysis, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 236f.

³ That is, his obligation to make this offence known.

⁴ Kkh C^e reads *vā* for *va*. This is not listed among the variants in Kkh 214,2. Furthermore, Kkh 214,2 puts a comma after *pācittiyam*. The comma should be deleted since *pācittiyam* forms the direct object of *āpajjītvā*.

⁵ This means that even though the bhikkhu finally reveals the other bhikkhu's offence, he nevertheless has committed an offence entailing expiation because he had given up his obligation earlier. See the parallel in Sp IV 866,16ff.: *sace*

⟨214⟩

Suddhapācittiya 64 M

425

^g—But if having thus given up [his] obligation, he tells another only in order to conceal it, this one too in this way, “[I will tell] another [in order to conceal it]”, commits [an offence] indeed—even if [there are] one hundred *samanas*¹—as long as the end [of this chain] is not cut off. But how is the end cut off?^g If one having committed [an offence] tells one [person, and] this [person] too ^htells another [person, and] that [person], turning back, tells the very one by whom he was told, thus [it] having been told to the second by the third person, [the end of the chain] is cut off.^{2-h}

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning a certain bhikkhu (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “concealing a gross offence” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is [an offence entailing] expiation in the first point concerning a gross offence.³ There is [an offence of] wrong doing in the other two.⁴ There is a triple [offence of] wrong doing concerning a non-gross [offence].⁵ There is indeed [an offence of] wrong doing concerning a transgression — gross or not gross — of one who is unordained⁶ (=

^g—^gSp IV 866,18–21 ^h—^hSp IV 866,26ff.

pi dhuram nikhipitvā pacchā āroceti na rakkhati, dhuram nikkhittamatte yeva pācittiyan ti vuttam hoti. “Even if, having given up his obligation, he later announces [the other bhikkhu’s offence, this] does not protect [him from an offence. With this] it is said that by merely having given up [his] obligation indeed an offence entailing expiation [arises].”

¹ That is to say, even if the offence of the offender has been reported like this by one hundred *samanas*.

² As the commentaries explain, the second person has committed an offence because of concealing an offence already when he told the third person. Now, when the third person tells him again, the second cannot commit that same offence again (Sp-ṭ III 84,5–8 = Kkh-nṭ 408,25–409,2). This sequence is marked as a quotation of Elder Mahāpaduma in Sp.

³ That is to say, thinking it is a gross offence when it is a gross offence, he conceals it (Vin IV 128,6f., BD III 8).

⁴ Being in doubt or thinking it is not a gross offence when it is a gross offence, he conceals it (Vin IV 128,7ff., BD III 8).

⁵ Vin IV 128,12ff. (BD III 9).

⁶ Vin IV 128,10ff. (BD III 9). Thānissaro (2007: I 462) comments on this, saying,

426 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨214⟩

6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for him not telling [thinking], ⁱ—“There will be quarrels, etc., for the Saṅgha”^{–i} or ^j—“This one, harsh and rough, will make an obstacle to life (*jīvita*) or to the holy life (*brahmacariya*)”,^{–j} for one not seeing a proper bhikkhu, for one not desiring to conceal, for one not telling, [thinking], ^k—“It will be made known by his own action”,^{–k} and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

These are the two constituent factors here: (i) knowing about a gross offence of an ordained [person], (ii) giving up [his] obligation [thinking], “Because of the desire to conceal I shall not tell” (= 9. constituent factors).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are exactly the same as for [the rule about] admonition (Sgh 10 M).¹

The commentary on the rule about gross offences is finished.

[5. The commentary on the rule about less than twenty years]

[65. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should knowingly ordain a person less than twenty years old, that person is unordained and those bhikkhus are censurable; this is [an offence entailing] expiation for him [who ordained].*

(Pāt 68,16ff. = Vin IV 130,15ff.)]

In the fifth [rule,² a—a person] less than twenty years old (*ūnavatisvassam*, Pāt 68,16) means: [a person]^{—a} not having completed twenty years ^a—starting from his gaining rebirth (i.e. conception).^{—a}

Should ordain (*upasampādeyya*, Pāt 68,16f.) means: should ordain as a preceptor.

That person is unordained (*so ca puggalo anupasampanno*, Pāt 68,17) means: ordained by someone knowing or not knowing [that he is less

ⁱ—ⁱ ≠ Vin IV 128,16f. ^j—^j Vin IV 128,18f. ^k—^k Vin IV 128,21 ^a—^a Sp IV 867,15f.

“None of the texts explicitly define the term *unordained person* here, but because bhikkhus have no responsibility to tell other bhikkhus of the misdeeds of lay people, the sense of the rule would seem to require that it cover only bhikkhunīs, trainees, male novices, and female novices.”

¹ Sgh 10 M is actually called *saṅgha-bheda-sikkhāpada*, thus the name here for the classification of the origins and the name of the first rule where it appears do not tally.

² This rule belongs to those providing a link between the old locative rules, and the *yo pana bhikkhu* rules, see von Hinüber 1999: 53, 82.

⟨215⟩*Suddhapācittiya 65 M*

427

|that twenty years old], ^b—he is indeed unordained. But if he, at the end of
|ten years, ⟨215⟩ ordains another, [and] if, having excepted him [in count-
|ing], the quorum (*gana*) is complete,¹ [the one newly ordained] is well
|ordained. Also, as long as he (i.e. the unordained one) does not know,
|for so long there is neither an obstacle to heaven nor an obstacle to release,
|but having gained knowledge [about it], he is to be ordained again.^{—b}

|*And those bhikkhus are censurable (te ca bhikkhū gārayhā, Pāt 68,17f.)*
|means: except for the preceptor, the remainder are censurable; they all
|commit [an offence of] wrong doing.

|*This is [an offence entailing] expiation for him (idam tasmiṃ
pācittiyam, Pāt 68,18)* means: but he who ordains as a preceptor, for that
|very person this is to be understood as [an offence entailing] expiation.
|Therefore, whoever [thinking,] ^c—“I will ordain”, thus seeks a quorum or
|a teacher or a bowl or a robe, or agrees upon a boundary,^{—c} or defines a
|[boundary consisting in a] throw of water,² he — having committed
|offences of wrong doing in respect of all these duties, [namely] in respect
|of the motion, and in respect of the [first] two proclamations — at the
|end of the proclamations³ commits [an offence entailing] expiation.

|[This rule] was proclaimed at Rājagaha (= 1. *provenance*) concerning
|many bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter

^b—^bSp IV 868,13–17 ^c—^cVin IV 130,20ff.

¹ This refers to the fact that there must be a quorum of bhikkhus of at least ten years standing for an ordination of a new bhikkhu to be valid.

² Kkh here takes up from the Vinaya the usual enumeration of actions which the person functioning as a preceptor in an ordination has to do before ordination (compare Vin IV 130,20ff.; 227,5, etc.; Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 130ff.). But it adds one element not listed there: that is the defining of an *udakukkhepa* (“throw of water”). Since the latter also functions as a monastic boundary (*sīmā*), this is actually covered already by the words *sīmā sammannati*. The only difference is that the *udakukkhepa-sīmā* belongs to the undetermined *sīmās* (*abaddha-sīmā*), whereas a *sīmā* to be agreed upon belongs to the determined *sīmās* (*baddha-sīmā**, see above, p. 21). This can be understood as evidence that at the time of the origination of Kkh the usage of an *udakukkhepa-sīmā* had gained prominence already. For this development, see Kieffer-Pülz 1997: 152f.

³ That is, after the third proclamation, or at the end of the entire legal procedure (*kamma-vācā-pariyosāna*). *Kamma-vācā** is used for the formula of the entire procedure, as well as for the proclamations (one or three, depending on the type of procedure) which are otherwise called *anussāvanā*.

428 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* **〈215〉**

“ordaining someone less than twenty years old” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is [an offence of] wrong doing for one who is in doubt about [the candidate for ordination being less than twenty years old] when he is less than twenty years old,¹ for one thinking that he is less when he is the full twenty years old, and for one who is in doubt² (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one who thinks that [the candidate for ordination] is fully [twenty years old] in both cases (i.e. whether he is or not), and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) being less than twenty years old, (ii) thinking that he is less, (iii) the ordination (= 9. *constituent factors*). [126]

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] taking what is not given (Pār 2 M),

but [the offence against] this [rule is] a fault according to a precept [laid down by the Buddha] (= 14. *fault*),

[is done with] three [types of] thought (= 16. *thoughts*),

[with] three [types of] feeling (= 17. *feelings*).

The commentary on the rule about less than twenty years is finished.

[6. The commentary on the rule about a caravan of thieves]

[66. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should knowingly by arrangement set out on the same road for journeying together with a caravan of thieves, even to another village, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 68,20ff. = Vin IV 131,21ff.)]

In the sixth [rule], thieves who have deceived the king or are desirous of being exempt from taxes [and] have set out on a road — whether they have committed an action or not committed an action — in respect of them here, for one thinking it is a caravan of thieves, [or] for one going together with it by arrangement, having gained knowledge of its status of being a caravan of thieves, the regulation of the offences

¹ Vin IV 130,27f. (BD III 14).

² Vin IV 130,29ff. (BD III 14).

⟨216⟩*Suddhapācittiya 66 M*

429

concerning the arranging and the going is to be known according to the manner stated in the section about instruction (*ovāda-vagga*).¹ ⟨216⟩

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning a certain bhikkhu (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “setting out by arrangement on the same road for journeying together with a caravan of thieves” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is [an offence of] wrong doing for one going, having made an arrangement all by himself if the people do not make an arrangement,² for one who is in doubt about the caravan of thieves [when it is a caravan of thieves],³ for one thinking it is a caravan of thieves when it is not a caravan of thieves, and for one who is in doubt⁴ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one who thinks it is not a caravan of thieves [whether it is one or not],⁵ going not having made an arrangement or with a flawed appointment (*visaṅketa**) concerning the time, or in the case of disasters, and for one who is insane,⁶ etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the four constituent factors here: (i) being a caravan of thieves, (ii) knowing, (iii) arranging, [and] (iv) going without a flawed appointment (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The [offence against this rule has the] origin of the rule about a caravan of thieves (Pāc 66 M) (= 10. [sorts of] origin),⁷

[it originates in] activity (= 11. *activity*),

[has] acquittal due to [lacking] awareness (= 12. *awareness*),

¹ The *ovāda-vagga* is comprised of the rules Pācittiya 21 to 30, and is alternatively called the *bhikkhunī-vagga* (in Sp IV 786,21). The rule relevant to the present context is Pāc 27 which regulates a bhikkhu’s journeying on the same road together with a bhikkhunī by arrangement. Here, the author of Kkh gives the regulation of the offences (Kkh 171,18–28, see above, pp. 342f.).

² Vin IV 132,4f. (BD III 17).

³ Vin IV 132,3 (BD III 17).

⁴ Vin IV 132,5ff. (BD III 17).

⁵ Vin IV 132,3f. and 7f. (BD III 17). Here, it is a caravan of thieves.

⁶ Except for the first non-offence case, which is handed down in the casuistry in the Vinaya, the remainder is in the non-offence clause (Vin IV 132,9ff., BD III 17).

⁷ That means that the present rule is the first with this origination (*samuṭṭhāna*); for details concerning this system, see von Hinüber 1992a.

430 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨216⟩

is [dependent on] intention (= 13. *intention*),
 [is] a fault according to a precept [laid down by the Buddha] (= 14. *fault*),
 [is] a physical deed, a verbal deed (= 15. *deeds*),
 [is done with] three [types of] thought (= 16. *thoughts*),
 [with] three [types of] feeling (= 17. *feelings*).

The commentary on the rule about a caravan of thieves is finished.

[7. The commentary on the rule about arrangements]

[67. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should by arrangement set out on the same road for journeying together with a woman, even to another village, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 68,24ff. = Vin IV 133,6ff.)]

In the seventh [rule, the rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning a certain bhikkhu (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “setting out by arrangement¹ on the same road for journeying together with a woman” (= 3. *subject matter*).

^d—The remainder here is to be understood exactly according to the manner stated in the rule about arrangements with a bhikkhuni² (Pāc 27 M).^{—d}

The commentary on the rule about arrangements is finished.

[8. The commentary on the rule about Aritṭha]

[68. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should say thus, “In such a way I understand the Doctrine taught by the Blessed One that those things said by the Blessed One to be obstructions are not in fact sufficient as obstructions for one indulging in them”, then that bhikkhu is to be spoken to by the bhikkhus thus, “Do not, venerable sir, speak thus, do not misrepresent the Blessed One; for misrepresentation of the Blessed One is not good; for the Blessed One would not say thus. In many ways, friend, have things that are obstructions been said by the Blessed One to*

^{d—d}Sp IV 869,4f.

¹ In Kkh 216,18 *saṃvidhāya* is not in the main text, but only given as a variant of C^e in n. 8. It should certainly be mentioned in the main text, since it is also contained in the rule and because (Pāc 66 M) *saṃvidhāya* is also mentioned in the “subject matter” in the parallel rule; see Kkh 216,2, above, p. 429.

² Both rules are called *saṃvidhāna-sikkhāpada*, Pāc 27 M and Pāc 67 M. Therefore, the addition *bhikkhuniyā* is necessary here.

⟨217⟩

Suddhapācittiya 68 M

431

be obstructions, ⟨217⟩ and they are sufficient as obstructions for one indulging in them.” And should that bhikkhu, being spoken to thus by the bhikkhus, persist in the same way [as before], then that bhikkhu is to be admonished by the bhikkhus up to the third time for giving up that [course of action]. If, being admonished up to the third time, he should give it up, that is good; if he should not give it up, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.

(Pāt 70,2–14 = Vin IV 135,18–30)]

In the eighth [rule,¹ things that are] e—obstructions (*antarāyikā*, Pāt 70,3) means: they make an obstruction to heaven and release. They are fivefold by virtue of procedures (*kamma**)² defilements (*kilesa*)³ fruition [of former births] (*vipāka*)⁴ reproach (*upavāda*)⁵ [and] transgression of rules.^{6–e} Among them with reference to obstructions consisting in the transgression of rules, not seeing fault in the transgression through sexual intercourse, [thinking] “The touch of women too is suitable like the touch of soft coverings”, etc., it is said, f—“*Those things said by the Blessed One to be obstructions are not in fact obstructions for one indulging in them*”—f (Pāt 70,3f).

In many ways (*anekapariyāyena*, Pāt 70,7f.) means: by many motives such as g—“sensual pleasures are like skeletons”,^{–g} etc.

e—e Sp IV 869,9ff. f—f Vin IV 135,19f. g—g Vin IV 134,19f.

¹ For the development of this rule, see von Hinüber 1999: 67f., 70.

² According to Kkh-nt *kamma** here stands for the five acts of immediate retribution (Kkh-nt 410,19: *ettha ca pañcānantariyakammañ kammantarāyikam nāma*); see also CPD and DOP s.v. ānantarika- or °iya ... -*kamma*, matricide, patricide, killing an arahat, shedding a Buddha’s blood, and causing a split in the monastic community (for details regarding the ānantarika-*kamma*, Skt ānantaryā-*karma*, see Silk 2007). The commentary, furthermore, adds the act of raping a bhikkhunī (*bhikkhuni-dūsaka-kamma*), and says these acts are an obstruction to release, not to attaining heaven (Kkh-nt 410,18–21).

³ As defilements the commentary lists *niyata-micchā-ditthi-dhammā* (Kkh-nt 410,21).

⁴ For instance to be born as a “eunuch” (*pañdaka*; above, p. 73, n. 1), animal, or hermaphrodite (Kkh-nt 410,21f.).

⁵ The reproach of an *ariya* (Kkh-nt 410,22f.).

⁶ This refers to deliberately committed offences according to the commentary (Kkh-nt 410,24f.).

432

Bhikkhupātimokkha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation ⟨217⟩

That bhikkhu [...] by the bhikkhus (so bhikkhu [...] bhikkhūhi, Pāt 70,10) means: whoever sees or hears, by them he is to be spoken to three times thus, Do not, venerable sir, speak thus, ... and they are sufficient as obstructions for one indulging in them” (mā āyasmā evam avaca ... pe ... alañ ca pana te pañisevato antarāyāyā ti, Pāt 70,5–9).

This having been said, it is [an offence of] wrong doing for one who does not relinquish [his statement; an offence of] wrong doing also for those who, having heard [his statement] [127], do not speak.¹ Again, having dragged him even to the middle of the Saṅgha, he is to be spoken to in exactly the same way. There, also, it is indeed [an offence of] wrong doing in his not relinquishing² and in the non-speaking of the others.³ Even thus not relinquishing, again *he is to be admonished up to the third time* (*yāvatatiyām samanubhāsitabbo*, Pāt 70,11) by means of a procedure [with a decision as] the fourth [element] after [putting] the motion (*ñatticatutthakamma**). Then for him [still] not relinquishing, again there is [an offence of] wrong doing by the [end of the] motion and the [first] two [subsequent] proclamations. There is [an offence entailing] expiation at the end of the [third] proclamation.⁴

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Ariṭṭha (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “not relinquishing an evil view” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with a command (= 5. *command*).

¹ Vin IV 136,1f. (*BD III 25*). Contained in the Word Analysis.

² Vin IV 136,5 (*BD III 25*). Contained in the Word Analysis.

³ The case where the others do not speak is not mentioned again in this case in the Vinaya, but the first instance (having heard, they do not speak, Vin IV 136,2) covers all the cases.

⁴ Or: “at the end of the formula for the procedure” (*kamma-vācā**). In the comparable rule Sgh 10 M, it is stated that with the arising of the offence entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha, the offence of wrong doing and the two grave offences committed at the end of the motion and the first two proclamations respectively are revoked. Here, in Pāc 68 M, nothing like this is mentioned. See also Thānissaro 2007: I 471.

⟨218⟩*Suddhapācittiya 69 M*

433

| There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ There is a triple [offence of] wrong doing in respect of a legally invalid act² (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

| There is no offence for one not being admonished, for one relinquishing, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

| These are the three constituent factors here: (i) being a lawful procedure, (ii) the admonishment, (iii) not relinquishing (= 9. *constituent factors*).

| The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are exactly the same as for [the rule about] admonition (Sgh 10 M).

| The commentary on the rule about Ariṭṭha is finished. ⟨218⟩

| [9. The commentary on the rule about common enjoyment³
| together with one who is suspended]

| [69. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should knowingly enjoy together with or be in communion with or make a joint sleeping place with a bhikkhu who speaks thus, who has not acted according to the rule,⁴ and who has not relinquished that view, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

| (Pāt 70,16–19 = Vin IV 137,17–20)]

| In the ninth [rule],⁵ with [a bhikkhu] who speaks thus (*tathā-vādinā*, Pāt 70,16) means: with one who says “In such a way I [understand] the Doctrine [taught] by the Blessed One” etc.⁶

| h—With one who has not acted according to the rule (*akatānudhammena*, Pāt 70,16f.) means: “according to the rule” (*anudhammo*) is said [to be] the restoration (*osāraṇā*) performed for one who is suspended lawfully according to the Vinaya in respect of either not seeing an offence or

h-h Sp IV 870,20–25

¹ Vin IV 136,26–29 (BD III 26).

² Vin IV 136,29f. (BD III 26).

³ *sambhoga*, literally “common enjoyment” or “common eating”, stands for the common supplies of the community, and in the course of time refers to an “alms district” according to Hu-von Hinüber 2017: § 1.1; A detailed study of all references in the Theravāda Vinaya is found in Hu-von Hinüber 2016: 42ff.

⁴ For this expression, see von Hinüber 1999: 56.

⁵ For the relation of this rule to the preceding and following Pācittiyas and for its development, see von Hinüber 1999: 68ff.

⁶ This is the explanation given in the Word Analysis to *tathāvādinā* (Vin IV 137,24). It corresponds to the explanation of *evam vadeyya* in Pāc 68 M (Vin IV 135,32f.).

434

Bhikkhupātimokkha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation

⟨218⟩

non-atonement or not relinquishing an evil view, after [he] has perceived the adequate observance.¹ For whom that “according to the rule” (*anudhammo*) called restoration has not been performed, he is called one who has not acted according to the rule.² With such a one is the meaning.³

Or should enjoy with (*sambhuñjeyya vā*, Pāt 70,17f) means: should make a joint enjoyment of food or a joint enjoyment of the Doctrine.³

Or should be in communion with (*samvaseyya vā*, Pāt 70,18) means: should make a procedure of the Saṅgha, such as the observance (*uposatha*).⁴

*Or should make a joint sleeping place*⁵ *together with* (*saha vā seyyam kappayya*, Pāt 70,18) means: should lie down under the same roof, even if with various precincts.⁶ There, in respect of “the enjoyment

¹ *anuloma-vattam*; following the commentary, this refers to the reduced rights of a suspended bhikkhu (Kkh-nṭ 412,11ff).

² CPD s.v. *akatānudhamma* wrongly gives “who has not been dealt with according to the law”, a meaning relatively widespread if one compares the various translations of this rule (summarized by Nāṇatūsa 2014: 239). IBH already hinted at this wrong translation (BD III 27, n. 3). See also Nolot (1999: 46) with the definition of the Word Analysis to the present rule (Vin IV 137,27): *akatānudhammo nāma ukkhitto anosārito*, “one who does not behave according to the rule is one who is suspended, who is not restored”.

³ See for the various *sambhogas*, Hu-von Hinüber 2016: §§ 3.1.1–2, 7.1, 7.5; Hu-von Hinüber 2017: § 3.1.1.

⁴ *samvasati*, in addition to the mere living together (*saṃvāsa**), means especially the communal living together which includes the performance of procedures (*kamma**), the joint recitation of the Pātimokkha on the observance day, etc.

⁵ See the same wording in the rules Pāc 5 and 6 M, above, pp. 287, 289. The words are commented upon in a totally different manner, however. In Pāc 5 and 6 M the Word Analysis states that the place may be totally roofed or totally enclosed, or partly roofed, or partly enclosed (Vin IV 17,1f.; 19,36f.); in Pāc 69 M the place is simply characterised as “under one roof” (*eka-cchanne*, Vin IV 138,3). This has legal implications; see below, pp. 434f., n. 6.

⁶ In the Word Analysis the place where they lie down together is characterised simply by “under one roof” (*eka-cchanne*, Vin III 138,3) without specifying whether it is in a place entirely or partly roofed or walled in (so in Pāc 5 and 6 M, see above, p. 287, n. 2). The question of the existence of one or several entrances is relevant for various rules, especially those connected with robes. Because of the designation as *eka-cchanne* in the Word Analysis, according to

⟨218⟩

Suddhapācittiya 69 M

435

|of material goods” (*āmisa-paribhoga*)¹ – it is a single [offence entailing]
|expiation for one giving or taking by a single action even [if it is]
|much. – There being division, it is [an offence entailing] expiation in
|each action. In respect of “the joint enjoyment of the Doctrine” (*dhamma-
|sambhoga*), for one reciting or having had recite with words, etc., the
|exact determination of offences is to be known according to the manner
|stated in the rule about [reciting] the Doctrine word by word (Pāc 4
|M);² in respect of “being in communion with” [the exact determination
|of offences is to be known] by virtue of the end of the procedure;³ in
|respect of “making a joint sleeping place together” [the exact deter-
|mination of offences is to be known] by virtue of the action of lying
|down of the one when the other was lying down [already].⁴

|[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the
|group of six (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “enjoy-
|ing together with the bhikkhu Ariṭṭha” (= 3. *subject matter*).

| [The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and
|bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

| It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

| There is [an offence of] wrong doing for one who is in doubt about
|[his companion] having been suspended [when he is suspended],⁵ for
|one who thinks he is suspended when he is not suspended, and for one
|who is in doubt⁶ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

¹⁻¹i-*Sp IV 870,26f.*

| Sp-ṭ III 88,25–89,1, Kh here adds “even if with various entrances” (*nānūpa-
|cāre pi*). This implies that a bhikkhu in good standing who lies down in some
|room commits an offence entailing expiation, even if the suspended bhikkhu
|is lying in a separate room with its own entrance but under the same roof.

¹ Whereas *paribhoga* is used here, *sambhoga* is applied in connection with
|*dhamma*. This indicates that *paribhoga* and *sambhoga* are synonyms. Kieffer-
|Püllz (2013: III 1850) refers to the fact that Vmv uses *sambhoga*, Sp-ṭ *pari-
|bhoga*. For *sambhoga*, see Hu-von Hinüber 2016: § 3.1; 2017: § 3.1.

² See above, p. 286. An explanation is also to be found in the Word Analysis of
|the present rule (Vin IV 137,30–35, BD III 29).

³ See Vin IV 138,1f. (BD III 29).

⁴ See Vin IV 138,3–7 (BD III 29).

⁵ Vin IV 138,9f. (BD III 30).

⁶ Vin IV 138,11f. (BD III 30).

436 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨219⟩

There is no offence for one who thinks he is not suspended in both respects [whether he is or is not suspended], for one knowing, “He is restored” or “He has relinquished that view”, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) the fact that he has not acted according to the rule, (ii) knowing, (iii) the reason consisting in joint enjoyment, etc.¹ (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [*sorts of*] *origin*), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] taking what is not given (Pār 2 M),

but the [offence against] this [rule is] a fault according to a precept [laid down by the Buddha] (= 14. *fault*), ⟨219⟩

[is done with] three [types of] thought (= 16. *thoughts*),
[with] three [types of] feeling (= 17. *feelings*).

The commentary on the rule about common enjoyment
together with one who is suspended is finished.

[10. The commentary on the rule about Kāṇṭaka]

[70. Pāc M: *Even if a novice should speak thus, “In such a way I understand the Doctrine taught by the Blessed One: that those things said by the Blessed One to be obstructions are not in fact sufficient as obstructions for one indulging in them”, then that novice is to be spoken to by the bhikkhus thus, “Do not, friend novice, speak thus, do not misrepresent the Blessed One; for misrepresentation of the Blessed One is not good; for the Blessed One would not say thus. In many ways, friend, have things that are obstructions, been said by the Blessed One to be obstructions, and they are sufficient as obstructions for one indulging in them.” And should that novice, being spoken to thus by the bhikkhus, persist in the same way [as before], then that novice is to be spoken to by the bhikkhus thus, “Friend novice, from today the Blessed One is not to be claimed by you as your teacher nor is yours [the privilege of] making your bed with bhikkhus for two or three nights which other novices have. Get away with you, be off!” If any bhikkhu should knowingly speak in a friendly manner to a novice thus expelled or cause him to serve or enjoy [material goods or the Doctrine] together with*

¹ The three other causes are included in “etc.”

Page 485 job: 1272818

⟨219⟩ *Suddhapācittiya 70 M* 437

him or make his bedding together with him, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.

(Pāt 70,21–72,11 = Vin IV 139,18–34)].

In the tenth [rule],¹ novice (*samanuddeso*, Pāt 70,21) means: novice (*sāmañero*) (alternative word).

j—Get away with you (*cara*, Pāt 72,8) means: go.

Sir (*pi re*, Pāt 72,8) means: other, no friend of mine.

Be off (*vinassā*, Pāt 72,8) means: disappear. [By this] it is said, “Somewhere we cannot see you, go there”.j

Thus expelled (*tathā nāsitam*,² Pāt 72,9) means: here, [128] k—there are three [types of] expulsion (*nāsanā*): (i) [expulsion consisting in] expulsion from [the same] communion (*saṃvāsa-nāsanā*), (ii) [expulsion consisting in the removal of the external] mark (i.e. the robe) (*linga-nāsanā*), (iii) expulsion consisting in the act of punishment (*danḍa-kamma-nāsanā*).

(i) There, suspension in respect of not seeing, etc., of the offence, is “expulsion from [the same] communion”.³

(ii) a—“The seducer is to be expelled;—a b—expel the bhikkhunī Mettiyā”;—b this is “an expulsion consisting in [the removal of the external] mark”.⁴

(iii) c—“Friend novice, from today the Blessed One is not to be claimed by you as your teacher”;—c this is “an expulsion consisting in an act of

j—Sp IV 871,6f. k—Sp IV 870,35–71,4 a—Vin III 33,26, 28
 b—Vin II 79,21f.; III 162,38–63,1 c—Vin IV 139,28f.

¹ For this rule, see von Hinüber 1999: 64 n. 142; for its relation with the two preceding Pācittiyas, and its deveopment, see von Hinüber 1999: 68ff.

² Pāt 72,9; Kkh 219,16, 24, 29 written as *tathānāsitam*; Vin IV 139,32 *tathā nāsitam*.

³ *saṃvāsa-nāsanā*; this is a suspension — that is, an exclusion of a limited duration — from the same communion (*saṃvāsa**) of a local community, and as such is only applicable to bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs (see also Nolot 1999: 59f.). Such bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs do not loose their status as a bhikkhu or bhikkhunī per se, but are only excluded from the specific local community which has carried out the procedure against that monastic. Such a suspended bhikkhu or bhikkhunī could be accepted as bhikkhus or bhikkhunīs of good standing by other local communities with deviating views concerning the specific legal case.

⁴ *linga-nāsanā*, for details, see Appendix 38.

438 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨220⟩

punishment” (*dandā-kamma-nāsanā*). This is the one intended here.^k
Therefore it is said: *thus expelled* (Pāt 72,9). ⟨220⟩

^d—*Should speak in a friendly manner* (*upalāpeyya*, Pāt 72,9) means:
should favour^d [saying], “I will give [him]¹ a bowl or robe or recitation
or questioning.”²

^e—*Should cause to serve* (*upaṭṭhāpeyya*, Pāt 72,10) means:^e accepting
powder, clay, etc. [from him],³ ^e—he should cause the [novice] to
serve him.^e

Joint enjoying [of material goods and the Doctrine] and making his
bedding with [him], is of the exact manner stated in the previous rule
(Pāc 69 M).⁴ Therefore, even the exact determination of offences here
(i.e. in Pāc 70 M) is to be understood according to exactly the manner
stated in the preceding rule (Pāc 69 M).

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the
group of six bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject
matter “speaking in a friendly manner to the novice Kāñṭaka” (= 3. *sub-
ject matter*).

The remainder is exactly the same as that stated in the rule about
Ariṭṭha (Pāc 68 M).

The commentary on the rule about Kāñṭaka is finished.

The section about living beings, the seventh.

^{d-d}Sp IV 871,8

^{e-e}Sp IV 871,8f.

¹ *tassa*, added in the Word Analysis (Vin IV 140,13, BD III 34).

² Nearly identical with the explanation of the Word Analysis (Vin IV 140,13f.,
BD III 34)

³ *tassa*, added in the Word Analysis (Vin IV 140,15, BD III 34).

⁴ See above, pp. 433ff.

⟨220⟩

Suddhapācittiya 71 M

439

[h. The section about legitimately]¹

[i. The commentary on the rule about legitimately]

[71. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu, being spoken to by bhikkhus legitimately, should say thus, “Friends, I shall not train myself in this rule of training until I can ask some other bhikkhu [who is] a learned expert in the Vinaya about it”, there is [an offence entailing] expiation. By a bhikkhu while in training, bhikkhus,² it is to be known, to be asked, to be pondered. This is the proper course here.*

(Pāt 72,15–20 = Vin IV 141,19–24)]

f—In the first [rule] of the section about “legitimately”³ the meaning of this [sentence] “*being spoken to legitimately*” (*saha-dhammikam vuccamāno*, Pāt 72,15) is stated in the rule about “*being difficult to speak to*” (*dubbaca-sikkhāpada*, Sgh 12 M).⁴

g—*In this rule of training* (*etasmiñ sikkhāpade*, Pāt 72,16):⁵ the meaning is: g—what is stated in this rule of training, that I shall not train myself in for so long [as I have not consulted an expert] (*tāva*).^{4–g}

[*An offence entailing*] expiation (*pācittiyam*, Pāt 72,18): but here [an offence entailing] expiation is to be understood in each utterance for one speaking thus under a pretext from fear of disrespect.⁵

f—f Sp IV 871,13 g—g Sp IV 871,13ff.

¹ *saha-dhammika*^o (literally “in accordance with the rule”) according to the explanation given in the context of Sgh 12 M means “legitimate, legitimately” as an adjective and an adverb, and “co-religionist” as a noun. See above, p. 166, n. 2. Since the present section received its name from the first rule in this section, where *saha-dhammikanī* is used as an adverb, it is to be understood as “legitimately” here.

² von Hinüber 1999: 70, refers to the fact that this manner of direct address is unusual in the Pātimokha, which may be understood as evidence that there is an untraced *suttanta* that served as a template for this rule.

³ Kkh 79,24ff., see above, p. 166. The Word Analysis to Pāc 71 clearly explains *saha-dhammikam* as “in accordance with the rules” prescribed by the Blessed One (Vin IV 141,27f.).

⁴ The words from the rule are repeated here in a different order. The word *tāva*, translated as “for so long” in this explanation, does not appear explicitly in the translation of the rule, since the *na tāvā ... yāva na* construction is translated as “not ... until”.

⁵ If his behavior should be understood as disrespectful, it counted as a transgression of Pāc 54 M.

440 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨221⟩

By [a bhikkhu] while in training (*sikkhamānena*, Pāt 72,18) means: h—by one having accepted an instruction with [his] head [at the instructor's feet] as one indeed desirous of training.^{—h}

To be known (*aññātabbam*, Pāt 72,19) means: to be known (*ājāni-tabbam*; alternative verb form).

To be asked (*paripucchitabbam*, Pāt 72,19) means: to be asked: “What is the meaning of this?”

To be pondered (*paripañhitabbam*, Pāt 72,19f.) means: to be thought about, to be weighed. ⟨221⟩

[This rule] was prescribed at Kosambi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Elder Channa (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “speaking thus” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunis] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ There is a triple [offence of] wrong doing with respect to one who is unordained.² It is only [an offence of] wrong doing for one speaking thus in a manner such as, ^{i—}“This is not [conducive] to the effacing [of evil],”^{3—i} etc.,⁴ even if he is being spoken to by both of them⁵ about what is not prescribed [as a rule] (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one saying “I will know, I will train”, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

^{h—h}Sp IV 871,17 ^{i—i}Vin IV 142,2

¹ Vin IV 141,32—42,1 (BD III 37f.).

² Vin IV 142,13ff. (BD III 38).

³ As the Word Analysis shows, this is the reply of the bhikkhu who is admonished by the bhikkhus. In the present sentence of Kkh, the word order is such that this speech could be understood as being an example for something not laid down as a rule, because both ? are in the instrumental. This, however, does not make sense (*ubho hi pi “idam na sallekkhāyā” ti ādinā nayen’ eva appaññattena vuccamānassāpi evam vadato*, Kkh 221,3f.).

⁴ Vin IV 142,1—13 (BD III 38). In case of one who is unordained there also arises an offence of wrong doing if the bhikkhu is spoken to about what is laid down as a rule. This case is referred to by the “etc.”

⁵ That is, one ordained and one unordained.

⟨221⟩

Suddhapācittiya 72 M

441

These are the two constituent factors here: (i) the speech of an ordained [person] about what is laid down [as a rule], (ii) the speech in that manner because of the desire not to learn (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] taking what is not given (Pār 2 M),

but [the offence against] this [rule is done with an] unpleasant [type of] feeling (= 17. *feeling*).

The commentary on the rule about legitimately is finished.

[2. The commentary on the rule about perplexity]

[72. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should, when the Pātimokha is being recited, say thus, “But what is the use of these lesser and minor rules of training being recited, considering that they are conducive to worry, trouble, and confusion?”; in disparaging the rules of training there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 72,22–74,2 = Vin IV 143,16–19)]

In the second [rule]¹ j-being recited (*uddissamāne*, Pāt 72,22) means: j being spoken j-by a teacher to a pupil j or being recited by virtue of studying [it].

k-Lesser and minor (*khuddānukhuddakehi*, Pāt 72,23) means: lesser and minor (resolution of compound).

Considering that (*yāvad eva*, Pāt 72,24) means: [this is] an expression defining the limit of their being conducive. The [following] is said [by this]: For, whoever recites or causes to recite or study these, for them they are conducive for so long until remorse, worry, trouble, doubt, and confusion of mind arise indeed, [thinking] “Is this suitable, [129] is this not suitable?”

Alternatively, *yāvad eva* (Pāt 72,24) means: the state of excess. Its [syntactical] connection is with this [statement]: “They are conducive to” (*samvattanti*, Pāt 74,1), that is to say, “They are indeed exceedingly conducive to worry, trouble, confusion.”²^k

j-jSp IV 876,11 k-kSp IV 876,16–24

¹ This rule belongs to those providing a link between the old locative rules, and the *yo pana bhikkhu* rules, see von Hinüber 1999: 53; for the unit it makes with Pāc 68–73, see von Hinüber 1999: 66–70.

442 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨222⟩

In disparaging the rules of training (sikkhāpadavivānake, Pāt 74.1), the meaning is: there is [an offence entailing] expiation in the disparagement of, in blaming the rules of training. ⟨222⟩

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “disparaging the Vinaya” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ There is a triple [offence of] wrong doing in the disparagement of one who is unordained.² It is only [an offence of] wrong doing in the disparagement of another matter of both³ (= 6. [sorts of] *offence*).

There is no offence for one who does not wish to disparage, for one saying “Look, first acquire the Suttantas, or the verses, or the Abhidhamma; afterwards you will acquire the Vinaya”, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the two constituent factors here: (i) there being the desire to blame, (ii) the disparagement of the rules of training in the presence of an ordained [person] (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] taking what is not given (Pāc 2 M),

but [the offence against] this [rule is done with an] unpleasant [type of] feeling (= 17. *feeling*).

The commentary on the rule about perplexity is finished.

[3. The commentary on the rule about deception]

[73. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should, when the Pātimokha is being recited every half month, say thus, “Only now do I understand that this rule indeed is handed down in the Sutta (i.e. the Pātimokha), is contained in the Sutta, and comes up for recitation every half month.” If the other bhikkhus should know of that bhikkhu [that] this bhikkhu had*

¹ Vin IV 143.32ff. (BD III 42).

² Vin IV 143.37–44.2 (BD III 42).

³ Vin IV 143.34ff. (BD III 42).

<223>

Suddhapācittiya 73 M

443

already sat two or three times while the Pātimokha was recited, not to speak of more [times than that], then there is no release [from being guilty of an offence] for that bhikkhu because of ignorance. And whatever offence he has committed there, he must be made to deal with that as one [living] in accordance with the rules;¹ and in addition, his deceit is to be laid bare [saying], “It is no gain for you, friend, it is ill-gained by you, in that when the Pātimokha is being recited you do not heed well and pay attention.” This is [an offence entailing] expiation in respect of that deceptive [individual].

[Pāt 74.4-15 = Vin IV 144.23-33)]

^a-In the third [rule]² every half month (*anvaddhamāsam*, Pāt 74.4) means: each fortnight in succession.^{-a}

Being recited (uddissamāne, Pāt 74.4f.) means: being recited (alternative verb form) by virtue of the observance.

^b-*And whatever offence he has committed there (yañ ca tattha āpattim āpanno, Pāt 74.10f.) means:^{-b} having practised whatever misconduct he speaks thus, being desirous of making known the state of having committed [an offence] by ignorance; ^b-whatever offence he has committed in that misconduct.^{-b}*

^c-*He must be made to deal^{-c} with that ^c-as one [living] in accordance with the rules (tañ ca yathā-dhammo kāretabbo, Pāt 74.11) means: there is no release because of the fact that he committed [an offence] by ignorance. But as the Dhamma and the Vinaya stand, so he is to be caused to deal with that offence. <223> The meaning is: he is to be caused to confess [it] in [the case of an offence] requiring confession;³*

^{a-a}Sp IV 876,31f. ^{b-b}Sp IV 877,3f. ^{c-c}Sp IV 877,4-8

¹ For the expression *yathā-dhammo kāretabbo* in general and in this sentence specifically, see von Hinüber 1999: 54–62, esp. 58f. Nāṇatusita (2014: 256ff.) has assembled further material on this expression in connection with the present rule.

² This rule belongs to those providing a link between the old locative rules, and the *yo pana bhikkhu* rules, see von Hinüber 1999: 53; for the unit it makes with Pāc 68–73, see von Hinüber 1999: 66–70.

³ These are the five light offences, that is, all except Pārajika and Saṅghādisesa.

444 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨223⟩

he is to be caused to remove [it] in [the case of an offence] requiring removal.^{1-c}

And, in addition, his deceit is to be laid bare (uttari c' assa moho āropetabbo, Pāt 74.11f.) means: and in addition to dealing with that [offence] as one [living] in accordance with the rules,² his deceit is to be laid bare by a procedure [with a decision as] the second [element] after [putting] the motion,³ having censured him with words such as “[It is no gain] for you, friend.”⁴

This is [an offence entailing] expiation in respect of that deceptive [individual]” (*idam tasmiṃ mohanake pācittiyam*, Pāt 74.14) means: whoever, when [his] deceit has been laid bare thus, deceives again, in respect of that deceptive individual this [offence entailing] expiation is to be understood, not in respect of the deception not having been laid bare.⁵ [This is] the meaning.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “deception” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.⁶ There is a triple [offence of] wrong doing in respect of an unlawful procedure⁷ (= 6. [sorts of] offence). It is only [an offence of] wrong doing in respect of the deception not having been laid bare.

There is no offence for one by whom [the Sutta] was not heard at length, or was heard at length fewer than two or three times and for

¹ This refers to Saṅghādisesa offences. See also Nolot 1999: 13, n. 30.

² This takes up the sentence *tañ ca yathādhammo kāretabbo* from the rule (Pāt 74.11)

³ *ñattidutiyakamma**. The formula for this procedure is given in the Word Analysis of this rule (Vin IV 145.9–19, BD III 45).

⁴ Quoted from the rule, Pāt 74.12.

⁵ For that latter case the casuistry provides an offence of wrong doing (Vin IV 145.20, BD III 45).

⁶ Vin IV 145.22ff. (BD III 45f.).

⁷ Vin IV 145.24–27 (BD III 46).

⟨223⟩

Suddhapācittiya 74 M

445

| those who are not desirous of deceiving and for one who is insane, etc.
| (= 7. *non-offence*). |

| These are the four constituent factors here: (i) laying bare the
| deception, (ii) the desire to deceive, (iii) having heard [the Sutta] in the
| manner stated, (iv) the deception (= 9. *constituent factors*). |

| The origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., are the same as for [the rule
| about] taking what is not given (Pār 2 M), |

| but [the offence against] this [rule is done with an] unpleasant [type
| of] feeling (= 17. *feeling*). |

| The commentary on the rule about deception is finished. |

| [4. The commentary on the rule about a blow]

| [74. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu, being angry [and] displeased, should give a
| bhikkhu a blow, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*]

| (Pāt 74,17–18 = Vin IV 146,13f.) |

| In the fourth [rule], *should give a blow* (*pahāraṇ dadeyya*, Pāt 74,17f.)
| means: ^dhere, when a blow has been given because of the desire to strike,
| even if he dies, it is only [an offence entailing] expiation.^{1–d} [130]

| [This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the
| group of six (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “giving
| a blow” (= 3. *subject matter*). |

| [The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and
| bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*). |

| It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*). |

| There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.² There is a triple
| [offence of] wrong doing in respect of one who is unordained.³ But it is

^{d–d}Sp IV 877,16f.

¹ Since he had no intention of killing the other bhikkhu this does not come under the Pārājika rule (Pār 1 M).

² Vin IV 146,21ff. (BD III 48).

³ Vin IV 146,25ff. (BD III 48) lists four offences of wrong doing concerning one who is unordained, but actually these are only three. The first example simply mentions the case of an unordained person and the action of the bhikkhu. In the three subsequent cases it is stated in addition that the bhikkhu thinks the unordained person is ordained, unordained, or that he is in doubt about it.

With respect to the last case (*anupasampanne anupasampannasaññī, āpatti*

446 *Bhikkhupātimokkha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* **(224)**

only [an offence of] wrong doing in respect of cutting an ear, etc., even of an ordained [person] with the intention of making him unsightly¹ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

But there is no offence for one having the intention of release [from harm]² while being harmed by someone or other, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) being angry, (ii) there not being the intention of release, (iii) giving a blow to an ordained [person] (= 9. constituent factors). **(224)**

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are the same as for the first [rule entailing] defeat (Pāc 1 M),

but [the offence against] this [rule is done with an] unpleasant [type of] feeling (= 17. feeling).

The commentary on the rule about a blow is finished.

[5. The commentary on the rule about the palm of the hand]

[75. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu, being angry [and] displeased, should raise the palm of his hand against a bhikkhu, there is [an offence entailing expiation.*

(Pāt 74,2of. = Vin IV 147,14f.)]

dukkatasssa, Vin IV 146,27) IBH (BD III 48, n. 4) says, “Surely [this] should read *anāpatti*, no offence”, assuming that a bhikkhu who gives an unordained person a blow thinking that he is unordained, does not commit an offence. This case is, however, not listed in the non-offence clause of this rule (Vin IV 146,28f.). Furthermore, in none of the cases where a bhikkhu acts in some way or other to an unordained person he thinks to be unordained is his behaviour classified as a non-offence (see for instance, Vin IV 94,2f.; 111,25f., etc.; 264,8f.; 309,19f.). Sp IV 877,21ff., in the commentary on the word *anupasampannassa* states that giving such a person a blow is an offence of wrong doing. Thus, IBH’s statement is incorrect.

¹ This case is not listed in the Suttavibhaṅga to this rule, but it is mentioned in Sp IV 877,19ff.

² Vin IV 146,28f.: *anāpatti kenaci viheṭhiyamāno mokkhādhippāyo pahāram deti*, “There is no offence if, being harmed by someone or other, he gives a blow as one having the intention of release [from harm].”

^eIn the fifth [rule] *should raise the palm of his hand* (*talasattikam uggireyya*, Pāt 74,20f.) means: should move the body or anything attached to the body showing the form of giving a blow.^e And here there is [an offence entailing] expiation because of raising [his hand against a bhikkhu].^f But if, having raised [his hand against a bhikkhu], as one being oppressed, he gives a blow,^f ^git is only [an offence of] wrong doing, because of it not being given from a desire to strike.¹ Whatever is broken in respect of hands, etc., by that blow, there is only [an offence of] wrong doing.^g Here the remainder is all to be understood exactly in the manner stated in the previous rule (Pāc 74 M).

The commentary on the rule about the palm of the hand is finished.

[6. The commentary on the rule about unfounded]

[76. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should accuse a bhikkhu of an unfounded [offence] entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 76,2–3 = Vin IV 148,5f.)

In the sixth [rule]² *unfounded* (*amūlakena*, Pāt 76,2) means: devoid of any foundation such as having seen [it].³

Should accuse (*anudhamseyya*, Pāt 76,3) means: should rebuke or cause to be rebuked.

[*An offence entailing*] *expiation* (*pācittiyam*, Pāt 76,3): if the one rebuked knows at that very instant, “He is rebuking me”, it is [an offence entailing] expiation for the plaintiff.

^{e–e}Sp IV 878,3f. ^{f–f}Sp IV 878,8f. ^{g–g}Sp IV 878,10ff.

¹ In the previous rule, one who is in somebody’s clutches does not commit an offence if he gives a blow wanting to free himself. In the present example the rule states an offence entailing expiation if a bhikkhu who, as in the previous rule, is angry and displeased, raises his palm against a bhikkhu. In the non-offence clause it is stated that there is no offence if the bhikkhu, being harmed by someone or other, raises the palm of his hand as one wishing release from the harm. Thus the offence of wrong doing mentioned here is because the bhikkhu not only raises the palm of his hand, but in addition gives a blow.

² For the relation of this rule with a passage in the Cullavagga, see von Hinüber 1999: 65.

³ Compare the explanations of Sgh 8 M (Kkh 72,10ff.; above, pp. 153f.).

448 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨225⟩

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “accusing with an unfounded [offence] entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ It is [an offence of] wrong doing in respect of accusing because of a failure of conduct or a failure of view.² There is a triple [offence of] wrong doing in respect of one who is unordained³ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one thinking it is true, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

These are the four constituent factors here: (i) being ordained, (ii) the [offence entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha being unfounded, (iii) the accusation, ⟨225⟩ (iv) knowing at that very instant (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] taking what is not given (Par 2 M),

but [the offence against] this [rule is done with an] unpleasant [type of] feeling (= 17. *feeling*).

The commentary on the rule about unfounded is finished.

[7. The commentary on the rule about intentionally]

[77. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should intentionally provoke scruples in a bhikkhu [thinking], “Thus it will be unpleasant for him even for [just] a moment”, having done it for just that reason and no other, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 76,5–7 = Vin IV 149,9ff.)]

In the seventh [rule] *should provoke scruples* (*kukkuccam upadaheyya*, Pāt 76,5f.) means: should give rise [to them] saying [things]

¹ Vin IV 148,13–16 (BD III 52).

² Vin IV 148,16f. (BD III 52).

³ Vin IV 218,17–20 (BD III 52). As in the case of Pāc 74 M, four cases are actually listed, but they only stand for three different cases (see above, pp. 445f., n. 3).

⟨225⟩

Suddhapācittiya 78 M

449

such as ^h—“I think you are less than twenty years old.”—^h There is [an offence entailing] expiation in each utterance for one thus giving rise [to it] intentionally, there not being another reason for giving rise [to it].

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthī (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “[intentionally] giving rise to scruples” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ There is a triple [offence of] wrong doing in respect of one who is unordained² (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one not desirous of giving rise, for one speaking thus only from a wish to benefit [him], and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) being ordained; [131] (ii) there being a desire for discomfort, (iii) the giving rise to scruples (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., are exactly the same as for the immediately preceding [rule]³ (Pāc 76 M).

The commentary on the rule about intentionally is finished.

[8. The commentary on the rule about eavesdropping]

[78. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should stand eavesdropping upon bhikkhus who are quarrelling, disputing, engaged in contention, [thinking], “I shall hear what they are saying”, having done it for that reason and no other, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 76,9–12 = Vin IV 150,19–22)]

^h—^h ≠ Vin IV 149,16

¹ Vin IV 149,22ff. (BD III 54).

² Vin IV 149,25–28 (BD III 54).

³ That *anantara* refers to the preceding, not to the following rule, is clear, because nowhere in the classification system do we have a reference to a rule yet to come. In addition, it is clear from the reference in Sp IV 878,33–79,1, where the reference for the sorts of origin is to the rule about being unfounded (*amūlaka*) (Pāc 76 M).

450 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨226⟩

In the eighth [rule upon bhikkhus] who are quarrelling (*vivādāpannā-nam*, Pāt 76,10) means: who are engaged in a legal dispute [which has its basis in] a controversy (*vivādādhikaraṇam*) increased by quarrel and strife.

ⁱ-Eavesdropping (*upassutīm*, Pāt 76,10) means: near the sound; where standing it is possible to hear their speech; if he should stand there, [that] is the meaning.⁻ⁱ

There it is [an offence of] wrong doing in each footstep for one going from a state of desire to rebuke, [thinking], “There I shall hear.”

⟨226⟩ In going quickly as well as if one stays behind, exactly this is the method. But [if] he hears where [he is already] standing, for [him] standing there it is [an offence entailing] expiation. Even if they, while consulting, have come to the place where he himself stands, it must be made known, either coughing or saying, “I am here.” Even for one not acting thus, it is indeed [an offence entailing] expiation in the hearing.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “standing eavesdropping” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ There is a triple [offence of] wrong doing in respect of [eavesdropping upon] one who is unordained² (= 6. *[sorts of] offence*).

There is no offence for one going, [thinking], ^j“Having heard these I shall desist, I shall refrain, I shall be calm, I shall free myself”,^{-j} and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) being ordained, (ii) the intention to rebuke, (iii) hearing (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. *[sorts of] origin*), etc., is that of [the rule about] a caravan of thieves (Pāc 66 M),

ⁱ⁻ⁱSp IV 879,4f. ^{j-j}Vin IV 151,12f.

¹ Vin IV 151,5ff. (BD III 56).

² Vin IV 151,7-11 (BD III 56f.).

⟨226⟩*Suddhapācittiya 79 M*

451

but [an offence against] this [rule originates] either [in] activity or [in] inactivity (= 11. *activity*),
 has] acquittal due to [lacking] awareness (= 12. *awareness*),
 is [dependent on] intention (= 13. *intention*),
 [is a] fault according to common opinion (= 14. *fault*),
 [is] a physical deed, a verbal deed (= 15. *deeds*),
 [is done with an] unwholesome [type of] thought (= 16. *thought*),
 [with an] unpleasant [type of] feeling (= 17. *feeling*).

The commentary on the rule about eavesdropping is finished.

[9. The commentary on the rule about objecting to procedures]

[79. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu, having given his consent (that is, proxy vote) for lawful procedures, should later engage in criticism, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 76,14–16 = Vin IV 152,19ff.)]

In the ninth [rule],¹ for lawful procedures (*dhammikānam kammānam*, Pāt 76,14) means: for these four procedures performed in accordance with the Dhamma, the Vinaya, [and] the Teacher's teaching: (i) a procedure consisting in the [formal] consultation [of the chapter] (*apalokana-kamma**), (ii) a procedure consisting in a motion (*ñatti-kamma**), (iii) a procedure [with a decision as] the second [element] after [putting] the motion (*ñatti-dutiya-kamma**), [and] (iv) a procedure [with a decision as] the fourth [element] after [putting] the motion (*ñatti-catuttha-kamma**).

There, this is the regulation of the procedures in brief. There,

(i) "a procedure consisting in the [formal] consultation [of the chapter]" (*apalokana-kamma**), is called a procedure to be performed with the approval of the entire Saṅgha, having proclaimed this or that subject matter, having announced three times, "Does the Saṅgha approve?"

(ii) A procedure to be performed with the approval of the entire Saṅgha through a single motion is called a procedure consisting in a motion (*ñatti-kamma**).

(iii) A procedure to be performed through a single motion and one proclamation is called a procedure [with a decision as] the second [element] after [putting] the motion (*ñatti-dutiya-kamma**).

¹ For the old name of this rule as *khīyanaka*, see von Hinüber 1999: 62.

452 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨227⟩

(iv) But a procedure to be performed through a single motion ⟨227⟩ and three subsequent proclamations is called a procedure [with a decision as] the fourth [element] after [putting] the motion (*ñatti-catuttha-kamma**).

Among these, (i) ^k—the procedure consisting in the [formal] consultation [of the chapter] (*apalokana-kamma**) applies to five matters: (1) restoration [of novices]¹ (*osāraṇa*), (2) expulsion [of novices]² (*nissāraṇa*),³ (3) the act of shaving (*bhaṇḍu-kamma*), (4) the penalty by contempt⁴ (*brahma-danda*), (5) [a procedure] whose characteristic is the [type of the performed] procedure⁵ (*kamma-lakkhana*).^{—k}

^a—There, (1) expulsion (*nissāraṇa*) is such as the expulsion (*nāsanā*) of the novice Kāṇṭaka.^{6—a}

(2) Seeing such a one (i.e. as Kāṇṭaka) behaving properly, the entering [of the community] is to be understood as restoration (*osāraṇā*).

(3) The questioning for cutting the hair of one seeking ordination is called the act of shaving (*bhaṇḍu-kamma*).⁷

^{k—k}Sp VII 1402,16ff. ≠ Vin V 222,22ff. ^{a—a}≠ Sp VII 1402,20f.

¹ Restoration of a novice after a preceding expulsion via *danda-kamma*, see Nolot 1999: 42.

² That is to say, temporal expulsion of a novice who holds wrong opinions. This is reversible if the novice drops the wrong opinions.

³ Nolot (1999: 41) discusses the fact that the terms *nissāraṇa* and *osāraṇa* are dealt with in the reverse order in the Parivāra. This also is the case here in Kkh, and in Sp VII 1402,16ff., from which Kkh borrowed these passages. We have numbered “1 … 2 …” in both cases without trying to have the numbers match.

⁴ We follow here a suggestion by von Hinüber 1998b: 379–82 [2009: 289–92]. Von Hinüber assumes that *brahma-danda* goes back to an old Eastern **vamha-danda*, and is to be understood as “Strafe durch Verachtung”. Nolot (1999: 82–92) renders it as “maximal punishment”, based on the explanation of a thirteenth-century commentary, which is similar to Freiberger’s (1996) “higher penalty”.

⁵ *kamma-lakkhana*; IBH wrongly translated this as “characteristic mark of the formal act” (BD VI 364). The rendering as “proceeding determined by implication” (CPD s.v.) is based on the interpretation of this procedure, but is not a literal translation. A literal and correct rendering is “qualified by [the generic name of] the procedure [involved]” (Nolot 1996: 79). This is confirmed by the explanation below (Kkh 227,20ff.).

⁶ See Pāc 70, above, pp. 436–38.

⁷ Referring to the request for shaving the hair and beard of a novice, Vin I 77,7ff.; Nolot 1996: 80.

⟨227⟩

Suddhapācittiya 79 M

453

(4) For a scurrilous bhikkhu offending bhikkhus with ill-spoken utterances, the procedure called the penalty by contempt (*brahma-danda*) is to be performed thus: ^b—“The scurrilous bhikkhu so-and-so dwells offending bhikkhus with ill-spoken utterances. That bhikkhu may say what he likes, [but] that bhikkhu so-and-so must not be spoken to by the bhikkhus; he must not be instructed; he must not be taught.¹ I ask the Saṅgha, sir, [I32] ‘Does the giving of the penalty by contempt to the bhikkhu so-and-so please the Saṅgha?’ A second time I ask. A third time I ask, ‘Does the giving of the penalty by contempt to the bhikkhu so-and-so please the Saṅgha?’”^b

(5) But the ^c—not-to-be-greeted procedure which was allowed^c by the Blessed One for the bhikkhunīs concerning the subject matters “having uncovered their thighs, showing, etc., [them to the bhikkhunīs]^d”,² in the [following] manner: ^d—“Bhikkhus, that bhikkhu is to be made one who is not to be greeted by the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha”;³^d [that not-to-be-greeted procedure] which is to be performed by the bhikkhunīs seated [together] in [their] dwelling in the [following] manner: ^e—“Lady, the venerable one so-and-so shows what is unworthy of appreciation⁴ for bhikkhunīs. Does the not-to-be-greeted procedure against that venerable one please the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha?”^e Such a procedure — since the

^b—^bSp VII 1403,20–27^c—^cSp VII 1404,14^d—^dSp VII 1404,13f. = Vin II 262,9f.^e—^eSp VII 1404,21ff.

¹ In Vin II 290,16f. (BD V 402) the line of verbs is *n' eva vattabbo na ovaditabbo nānusāsitarabba*. It seems strange that in Kkh 227,10 we have *n' eva vattabbo na ovādānusāsanīm kattabbo, na ovaditabbo* (which is the reading of B^e), since *ovāda** thus is mentioned twice — all the more so since the entire section is borrowed from Sp VII 1403,20–27, where we have the same reading as in the Vinaya (Sp VII 1403,22f. without variants as far as can be seen). Kkh C^e reads *n' eva vattabbo n' eva ovaditabbo*, which in the light of the Vinaya passage also seems not to be the most probable variant. It is to be assumed, however, that the reading *ovādānusāsanīm kattabbo* in Kkh 227,10 is wrong for *ovaditabbo*.

² For the various cases, see Vin II 262,1ff. (BD V 363ff.).

³ Vin II 262,23f. (BD V 364).

⁴ *appasādanīyam* (C^e *apasādiyam*; Kkh 227 n. 8), Sp E^e *apasādikam*; *appa-sādanīya* “unworthy of appreciation” (CPD s.v.).

454 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨228⟩

procedure for it is the characteristic, not the restoration,¹ etc.² — is therefore called “the [procedure] whose characteristic is the [type of the performed] procedure” (*kamma-lakkhaṇa*).

^f—And the “[procedure] whose characteristic is the [type of the performed] procedure” is prescribed having bhikkhunīs as its basis.^{-f} And yet it applies to bhikkhus also. Therefore, the procedure consisting in the [formal] consultation [of the chapter] is to be performed by bhikkhus, too, having announced it three times: by those giving robes, etc., to those whose robes are stolen, etc., or by those enjoying things which are to be enjoyed, or taking away things which are to be taken away, or by those making a lawful agreement (*katikā*) of such a kind. All this comes solely under [the heading of “a procedure] whose characteristic is the [type of the performed] procedure”. Thus the procedure consisting in the [formal] consultation [of the chapter] applies to five matters.³ ⟨228⟩

(ii) ^g—The procedure consisting in a motion (*ñattikamma*) applies to nine matters: (1) admittance (*osāraṇa*), (2) driving out (*nissāraṇa*), (3) the observance (*uposatha*), (4) invitation (*pavāraṇa*), (5) agreement (*sammuti*), (6) giving (*dāna*), (7) formal acceptance (*patiggaha*), (8) postponing (*paccukkaddhana*), (9) “[a procedure] whose characteristic is the [type of the performed] procedure” (*kamma-lakkhaṇa*).^{-g}

There, (1) ^h—[saying], ⁱ—“Reverend sir, let the Saṅgha listen to me. [This person] so-and-so desires [higher] ordination from the venerable so-and-so. He has been instructed by me. If it is the appropriate time for the Saṅgha, let so-and-so come. He should be told, ‘Come.’”⁻ⁱ The admittance (*osāraṇā*) of someone desiring [higher] ordination in this manner is called admittance (*osāraṇā*).

^{f-f}Sp VII 1405,14f.
ⁱ⁻ⁱVin I 94,37–95,2

^{g-g}≠ Vin V 222,26ff.

^{h-h}Sp VII 1409,26–11,6

¹ What is meant is that this “procedure consisting in the [formal] consultation [of the chapter]” (*apalokana-kamma**) is characterized by the manner in which it is carried out, not by its content, as is the case of the earlier four types discussed, which are characterized by “restoration”, “expulsion”, etc. It therefore belongs to the fifth category of *apalokana-kammas**, the *kamma-lakkhaṇa*, and thus is “a procedure consisting in the [formal] consultation [of the chapter] whose characteristic is the [type of the performed] procedure.”

² The “etc.” takes up the other three types of *apalokana-kamma** (above, p. 451) characterized by their contents.

³ For details, see Nolot 1996: 80.

⟨229⟩*Suddhapācittiya 79 M*

455

(2) j—“Let the venerable ones listen to me. This bhikkhu so-and-so is a preacher of the Doctrine,¹ but to him neither the Sutta (i.e. the Pātimokkha) nor the Explanation of the Sutta (i.e. the Suttavibhaṅga) has been handed down. Not considering the meaning, he holds back the meaning under the shadow of the letter. If it is the appropriate time for the venerable ones, having had this bhikkhu rise² (*vuṭṭhāpetvā*), let the remaining [bhikkhus] settle that legal dispute”.^j Thus, in the regulation of a committee, the driving out of a bhikkhu who is a preacher of the Doctrine is called the driving out (*nissāraṇā*).³

(3) k—“Reverend sir, let the Saṅgha listen to me. Today is an observance [day] (*uposatha*) ... Let [the Sangha] perform the observance.”^k The motion put in this manner by virtue of the observance procedure is called “the observance” (*uposatha*).

(4) a—“Reverend sir, let the Saṅgha listen to me. Today is the invitation day of the fifteenth. If it is the appropriate time to the Saṅgha, the Saṅgha may invite.”^a The motion put in this manner by virtue of the invitation procedure is called “the invitation” (*pavāraṇā*).

(5) b—“Reverend sir, let the Saṅgha listen to me. [This person] so-and-so desires [higher] ordination from [the venerable] so-and-so. If it is the appropriate time for the Saṅgha, I should instruct so-and-so”;^b [or], c—“If it is the appropriate time for the Saṅgha, so-and-so should instruct so-and-so.”^c The motion put in this manner to agree upon (*sammannītum*) himself or another is called “agreement” (*sammuti*).

(6) d—“Reverend sir, let the Saṅgha listen to me. This robe of the bhikkhu so-and-so [133] which had to be forfeited [by him] has been forfeited to the Saṅgha. If it is the appropriate time for the Saṅgha, the Saṅgha should give [back] this robe to the bhikkhu so-and-so.”^d Giving [back] in this manner a robe, bowl, etc., which has been forfeited is called “giving [back]” (*dāna*). ⟨229⟩

(7) e—“Reverend sir, let the Saṅgha listen to me. This bhikkhu so-and-so remembers an offence, he discloses it, he declares it, he confesses it. If

¹j-j≠ Vin II 96,35-97,2 ²k-kVin I 102,33ff. ³a-a≠ Vin I 159,27ff. ⁴b-bVin I 94,21-24
¹c-cVin I 94,28f. ²d-dVin III 196,31-34 ³e-eVin II 103,12-17

¹ *dhammakathika*; that is, he speaks about the discourses.

² That is, to leave the committee (*ubbāhika*).

³ See also Nolot 1999: 43.

456

Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation ⟨229⟩

it is the appropriate time for the Saṅgha, I should formally accept [the confession of] the bhikkhu so-and-so's offence." [The bhikkhu then] should be addressed by him, "Do you see it?" [and having answered,] "Yes, I see it", [he should be addressed,] "In the future, you should restrain [yourself]."^e The formal acceptance of the [confession of an] offence in this manner is called "formal acceptance" (*paṭiggaho*).

(8) f—"Let the venerable ones who are residents listen to me. If it is the appropriate time for the venerable ones, let us now perform the observance (*uposatha*); let us recite the Pātimokha; let us invite on the coming new-moon day."^f The postponing of the invitation having been made in this manner is called postponing.

(9) In respect of the settling [of a dispute] by the covering up [as] with grass (*tiṇa-vatthāraka*)¹ the motion embracing all [those involved in the dispute],² and the individual motions within each individual party — all of these three motions are called "[a procedure] whose characteristic is the [type of the performed] procedure" (*kamma-lakkhana*).

Thus the procedure consisting in a motion applies to nine matters.

(iii) A procedure [with a decision as] the second [element] after [putting] the motion (*ñatti-dutiya-kamma**) applies to seven matters: (1) a revocation (*osāraṇa*), (2) a refusal (*nissāraṇa*), (3) an agreement (*sammuti*), (4) giving (*dāna*), (5) removal (*uddhāra*), (6) assigning (*desana*), (7) [a procedure] whose characteristic is the [type of the performed] procedure (*kamma-lakkhana*).

There, (1) the refusal (*nissāraṇa*) of a lay follower — possessed of eight qualities such as trying for non-receiving [of gains] by bhikkhus³ — by virtue of [the bhikkhus'] turning [their] bowl[s] upside down in

^{f-f}Vin I 175,35–76,1

¹ Dealt with in Vin II 86,31–88,7. For this method of settling disputes, see Kieffer-Pülz 2010: 209f.

² In this settling of a legal dispute a bhikkhu puts a motion for both parties to solve the conflict (Vin II 87,7–13); subsequently, two bhikkhus, each one within his party, put a corresponding motion within their parties (Vin II 87,13–23).

³ The other seven qualities are (2) trying for non-profiting by bhikkhus, (3) for non-residence for bhikkhus, (4) reviling and abusing bhikkhus, (5) causing a split among the bhikkhus, (6) speaking dispraise of the Buddha, (7) the Doctrine, or (8) the Saṅgha, see Vin II 125,17–20 (BD V 173).

[order to exclude [him] from communal life¹ together with the Saṅgha [by not accepting alms from him], is called refusal (*nissāraṇa*).²

(1) And for him precisely, when [he is] behaving properly the [re]vocation (*osāraṇā*) is to be understood by virtue of [the bhikkhus'] turning [their] bowl[s] up [again]. That is stated in the Khuddakkhandhaka (Cullavagga) with respect to the subject matter “the Licchavi Vaddha”.³

(3) g—An agreement (*sammuti*)⁴ is to be understood by virtue of the [following] agreements:

- (a) an agreement on a [monastic] boundary (*sīmā-sammuti*),⁵
- (b) an agreement on the [condition of] not being separated from the three robes (*ti-cīvara-avippavāsa-sammuti*),⁶
- (c) an agreement as to a rug (*santhata-sammuti*),
- (d) an agreement as to [the instalment into the office of a] food issuer (*bhattuddesaka*),
- (e) a lodging allocator (*senāsana-ggāhāpaka*),
- (f) a treasurer (*bhaṇḍāgārika*),
- (g) a robe receiver (*cīvara-ppatiggāhaka*),
- (h) a rice gruel distributor (*yāgu-bhājaka*),
- (i) a fruit distributor (*phala-bhājaka*),

¹ g—gSp VII 1411,24–31

² *asambhoga-karaṇattham*; literally, “in order to make non-common enjoyment”. *Sambhoga* normally refers to common supplies of the community, see above, p. 433, n. 3. Since a lay-follower neither eats nor lives together with monastics (see *VinTexts* III 120, n. 1) *asambhoga* in connection with lay followers refers to the fact that they are deprived of the possibility of giving alms, and thereby of gaining merit (Hu-von Hinüber 2016: 60f.).

³ For this procedure, see Vin II 125,_{20ff.} The whole procedure has been misunderstood by IBH (*BD* V 173ff.). A correct description is found in Rhys Davids and Oldenberg (*VinTexts* III 120ff.).

⁴ See Vin II 126,_{20ff.} (*BD* V 175f.), discussed by Hu-von Hinüber 2016: 60–64.

⁵ *sammuti* to *sammannati* “to agree upon”; this noun and verb are used for the instalment of monastics into specific positions within the Saṅgha; from its literal meaning, various freer translations are to be deduced as “determination” (in the context of a *sīmā*) or as an “allowance” of the Saṅgha (see above Niss 2 M); etc.

⁶ Vin I 106,9–19 (*BD* IV 138); see also above, pp. 14ff.

¹⁶ See above, p. 203.

458

Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation

⟨230⟩

- (j) a hard food distributor (*khajja-bhājaka*),
- (k) a disposer of small things (*appamattaka-vissajjaka*),
- (l) a robe allocator (*sātiya-ggāhapaka*),
- (m) a bowl allocator (*patta-ggāhāpaka*),
- (n) a superintendent of monastery attendants (*ārāmika-pesaka*),
- (o) a superintendent of novices (*sāmanera-pesaka*).¹

(4) Giving (*dāna*) is to be understood by virtue of the giving of a *kathina* cloth² and the robes of the dead.³

(5) Removal (*uddhāra*) is to be understood by virtue of the removal of a *kathina* cloth.⁴ ⟨230⟩

(6)^h-Assigning (*desanā*) is to be understood by virtue of assigning a site for a hut or a site for a *vihāra*.⁴

(7) But whichever of the two formulas for procedures [with a decision as] the second [element] after [putting] the motion are stated in respect of the settling [of a dispute] by the covering up [as] with grass (*tiṇa-vatthāraka*) — one in one party, one in the other party^{5-h} — and whichever ⁱ-formula is statedⁱ for the laying bare of [one's] deceit,⁶ etc., ⁱ-by virtue of them, “a [procedure] whose characteristic is the [type of the performed] procedure” (*kamma-lakkhaṇa*) is to be understood.

Thus a procedure [with a decision as] the second [element] after [putting] the motion (*ñatti-dutiya-kamma**) applies to seven matters.ⁱ

(iv) A procedure [with a decision as] the fourth [element] after [putting] the motion (*ñatti-catuttha-kamma**) also applies to just seven

^{h-h}≠ Sp VII 1411,31–36 ⁱ⁻ⁱSp VII 1411,36–12,2

¹ Even up to thirteen of these functions can be given to one monk (Sp III 578,27–29); see also von Hinüber 1995a: 19 [2009: 200], n. 34.

² *kathina-cīvara*. This term is not commonly used for the cloth presented to the Saṅgha for the purpose of the *kathina* ceremony (see CPD s.v.). More common is the term *kathina-dussa* (Vin I 254,16ff., BD IV 352ff.).

³ *mātaka-cīvara*; see Vin I 308,30ff., BD IV 442f.

⁴ Vin III 150,31ff. (Sgh 6 M; *kuṭi-vatthu-desanā*); 157 (Sgh 7 M; *vihāra-vatthu-desanā*). *Vihāra* might mean a dwelling for one or more bhikkhus.

⁵ After the mere *ñatti-kammas** to be performed by each of the two parties which are characterised as *kamma-lakkhaṇa* (see above, p. 452, n. 5), each party has to perform a *ñatti-dutiya-kamma** as well (Vin II 87,23–88,4, BD V 117f.); this is also characterised as a *kamma-lakkhaṇa*.

⁶ This refers to the formula given in Vin IV 145,9–19 (BD III 45) in the context of Pāc 73 M.

⟨230⟩

Suddhapācittiya 79 M

459

matters: (1) restitution (*osāraṇa*), (2) suspension (*nissāraṇa*), (3) agreement (*sammuti*), (4) giving (*dāna*), (5) rebuke (*niggaha*), (6) admonition (*samanubhāṣana*), (7) [a procedure] whose characteristic is the [type of the performed] procedure (*kamma-lakkhaṇa*).

There, (1, 2) j-suspension is by virtue of seven procedures such as the procedure of censure (*tajjanīya-kamma*), etc.,¹ and restoration (*osāraṇa*) is to be understood by virtue of the revocation of exactly these procedures.²

(3) Agreement (*sammuti*) is by virtue of an agreement about the instructor of bhikkhunīs.³

(4) Giving (*dāna*) is by virtue of giving probation (*parivāsa*)⁴ and giving *mānatta* penance.⁵

(5) Rebuke⁶ (*niggaha*) is by virtue of being sent back to the beginning.⁷

(6) Admonition (*samanubhāsanā*) is by virtue of the [following] eleven admonitions, [namely] [the rules with an offence] after the third [unheeded admonition] (*yāva-tatiyaka*): the [rule about] the follower of one who is suspended (*ukkhattānuvattikā*),⁸ [I34] the eight [rules with an offence] after the third [unheeded admonition],⁹ the “Ariṭha” [rule]¹ and the “Caṇḍakālī” [rule].²

j-jSp VII 1412,2-12

¹ “Etc.” stands for the following procedures: *nissaya-kamma*, *pabbājanīya-kamma*, *paṭisāraṇīya-kamma* and the three types of *ukkhepanīya-kamma*. All of them are discussed Vin II 2ff.; see Nolot 1999: 2ff.

² See also Nolot 1999: 44.

³ Vin IV 50,25 (allowance to agree upon an “instructor of bhikkhunīs”, *bhikkhun’-ovādaka*); 50,28–37 the formula (*kamma-vācā**) for the *ñatti-catuttha-kamma** with which a *bhikkhunovādaka* is installed in that position.

⁴ See for instance Vin II 57,1–13 (BD V 74).

⁵ See for instance Vin II 38,24–39,14 (BD V 56f.).

⁶ *niggaha* is used in the Parivāra in this context (Vin V 222,35, BD VI 365, n. 4).

⁷ Kkh 230,14 reads *niggaho*, m., whereas in the list Kkh 230,7 the neuter form *niggaham* is used.

⁸ See for instance Vin II 45,3–17 (BD V 62).

⁹ Pār 3 N (*ukkhattānuvattikā-sikkhāpada*) in the Vinaya (Vin IV 218,14–25), that corresponds to Pār 7 N (in the complete *Bhikkhunī-pātimokha*; Pāt 120,1–14).

¹⁰ The eight *yāva-tatiyaka* rules only summarized here are explicitly qualified as those valid for bhikkhunīs in Sp VII 1344,31ff. They are four Saṅghādisesa rules exclusive to bhikkhunīs, namely Sgh 7–10 N (if following the numbering in the

460 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨230⟩

(7) A [procedure] whose characteristic is the [type of the performed] procedure is to be understood by virtue of the procedure of ordination (*upasampadā*)³ and the procedure of reinstatement (*abbhāna*).⁴

Thus, a procedure [with a decision as] the fourth [element] after [putting] the motion applies to seven matters.⁵

Among these four procedures, ^k—a procedure consisting in the [formal] consultation [of the chapter] (*apalokana-kamma**) is to be performed only by consulting; it is not to be performed by virtue of a procedure consisting in a motion (*ñatti-kamma**), etc.

A procedure consisting in a motion (*ñatti-kamma**), too, is to be performed only by putting a motion; it is not to be performed by virtue of a procedure consisting in the [formal] consultation [of the chapter] (*apalokana-kamma**), etc.

But a procedure [with a decision as] the second [element] after [putting] the motion (*ñatti-dutiya-kamma**) is sometimes to be performed by consulting;⁴ sometimes it is not to be performed by consulting.

There, it is not suitable to perform the [following] six serious procedures by consulting:

(a) an agreement on a [monastic] boundary (*sīmā-sammuti*),⁵

^{k–k}Sp VII 1395,31–96,9 = VI 1195,14–25

Vinaya; Vin IV 235,21–42,24) or Sgh 10–13 (if following the numbering in the complete *Bhikkhunī-pātimokha*; Pāt 130,1–36,6); and four Saṅghādisesa rules shared by bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs, namely Sgh 14–17 N (according to the numbering in the complete *Bhikkhunī-Pātimokha*; Pāt 136,8–40,27). These rules, which correspond to Sgh 10–13 M (Vin III 171,1–86,23), are not printed in the Bhikkhunī section of the Vinaya.

¹ Pāc 68 M = Pāc 146 N, the only Pācittiya rule belonging to the *yāva-tatiyaka* rules, see above, p. 432.

² Pāc 36 N. Actually this rule bears the title *samsaṭṭha-sikkhāpada* in the Pātimokha, but its protagonist is Caṇḍakālī. Thus it may have originally borne the name Caṇḍakālī.

³ Vin I 95,10–34 (BD IV 123) for the final formula for ordination.

⁴ That is by an *apalokana-kamma**. This is allowed for less important *ñatti-dutiya-kammas** such as those with which the monastics are installed in positions within the Saṅgha (for instance Sp V 1098,7f.; 1121,8–11; VII 1396,3–8; see also Nolot 1996: 80, § 3a).

⁵ Vin I 106,9–19 (BD IV 138).

⟨231⟩

Suddhapācittiya 79 M

461

- | (b) abolishing a [monastic] boundary (*sīmā-samūhanana*),¹
- | (c) the giving of a *kaṭhina* cloth (*kaṭhina-cīvaradānam*),²
- | (d) the removal of a *kaṭhina* cloth (*kaṭhinuddhāra*),³
- | (e) the assigning of a site for a hut (*kuti-vatthu-desanā*),⁴
- | (f) the assigning of a site for a *vihāra* (*vihāra-vatthu-desanā*).⁵

| They are to be performed only having proclaimed the formula for
| the procedure [with a decision as] the second [element] after [putting]
| the motion (*ñatti-dutiya-kamma**). ⟨231⟩

| The remaining thirteen agreements,⁶ and the agreements about the
| allocator of lodgings⁷ and the giving of robes of the dead,⁸ these light
| procedures are suitable to be performed even by consulting, but they are
| indeed not to be performed by virtue of a procedure consisting in a
| motion (*ñatti-kamma**), etc.^{-k}

| A procedure [with a decision as] the fourth [element] after [putting]
| the motion (*ñatti-catuttha-kamma**) is to be performed only according
| to its own characteristics, not by virtue of the remaining procedures.

| Thus these procedures performed, each in accordance with its
| individual characteristic indeed, through the accomplishment of the
| subject matter (*vatthu*), the motion (*ñatti*), proclamation (*anussāvanā*),
| boundary (*sīmā*), [and the] assembly (*parisā*), because of their being
| performed according to the Dhamma, the Vinaya, [and] the teaching of
the Teacher, there is law in them, therefore they are called lawful. Thus,
having given [his] consent to these lawful procedures, there is [an
offence entailing] expiation in each utterance for him in engaging in
criticism later on.

| [This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the
| group of six (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “engag-
ing in criticism” (= 3. *subject matter*).

¹ Vin I 110,27–36 (BD IV 144f.).

² Vin I 254,14–25 (BD IV 353f.).

³ Vin IV 287,26–32 [Pāc 30 N] (BD III 303).

⁴ Vin III 150,31ff. [Sgh 6 M] (BD I 256).

⁵ Vin III 157,4ff. [Sgh 7 M] (BD I 268f.).

⁶ These are agreements as to offices, see Appendix 39.

⁷ *senāsana-ggāhāpaka*; Vin II 167,1–12 (BD V 233f.).

⁸ Vin I 308,30ff. (BD IV 442f.); see above, p. 458, with n. 3.

462 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨231⟩

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is [an offence of] wrong doing for one who is in doubt about a lawful procedure, for one who thinks it is a lawful procedure when it is an unlawful one, and for one who is in doubt¹ (= 6. *[sorts of] offence*).

There is no offence for one who thinks it is an unlawful procedure² and for one who criticises knowing, “Unlawfully or with an incomplete Saṅgha they perform a procedure against one not liable to a procedure”,³ and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) [it] being a lawful procedure, (ii) thinking that it is a lawful procedure, (iii) the criticism [after] having given [his] consent (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. *[sorts of] origin*), etc., are exactly the same as for [the rule about] taking what is not given (Pār 2 M);

but [the offence against] this [rule is done with an] unpleasant [type of] feeling (= 17. *feeling*).

The commentary on the rule about objecting
to procedures is finished.

[10. The commentary on the rule about going, not having given [his] consent (proxy vote)]

[80. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu, while the deliberation is [still] going on in the Saṅgha, should get up from his seat [and] depart, not having given his consent [proxy vote], there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 76,18–20 = Vin IV 153,8ff.)]

In the tenth [rule], *deliberation* (*vinicchayakathāya*, Pāt 76,18) means: as long as an announced subject matter is not decided, or having put the motion, the formula for the procedure⁴ is not finished, for so long the

¹ Vin IV 152,14–17 (BD III 60).

² Independent of whether it is a lawful or an unlawful procedure (Vin IV 152,15f.18, BD III 60).

³ Vin IV 152,19f. (BD III 60).

⁴ *kamma-vācā** either proclamations or the entire formula for a procedure. Since a procedure ends with the decision, not with the proclamation, it here probably stands for the formula.

⟨232⟩*Suddhapācittiya 8o M*

463

deliberation is said to be going on. Whatever bhikkhu in this [time] interval, because of a desire to invalidate the procedure, leaves the arm's reach [distance] within the assembly, for him there is [an offence of] wrong doing in leaving. There is [an offence entailing] expiation in having left. ⟨232⟩

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning a certain bhikkhu (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “going, not having given [his] consent” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is [an offence of] wrong doing for one who is in doubt about a lawful procedure, for one thinking it is a lawful procedure when it is an unlawful procedure, and for one who is in doubt¹ (= 6. *[sorts of] offence*).

But there is no offence for him who thinks it is an unlawful procedure,² and for one who goes, knowing, “There will either be quarrels, etc., in the Saṅgha”, or, [135]^a—“They will perform the procedure unlawfully or with an incomplete Saṅgha or against one not liable to a procedure”,^{—a} or as an ill one, or because of something to be done for an ill person, or as one being oppressed by excrements, etc., and not desiring to invalidate the procedure [thinking], “I will come back again”, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the six constituent factors here: (i) the deliberation going on, (ii) [it] being a lawful procedure, (iii) [it] being thought to be a lawful procedure, (iv) being established within the same boundary, (v) belonging to the same communion, (vi) leaving the distance of being in arm's reach (*hattha-pāsa**) [of the other bhikkhus] because of a desire to invalidate [the procedure] (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The [offence against this rule has the] origin of [the rule about] admonition (Sgh 10 M) (= 10. *[sorts of] origin*),

[it originates in] activity and inactivity (= 11. *activity*),

^a—^aVin IV 153,28f.

¹ Vin IV 153,20–24 (BD III 62).

² Independent of whether it is a lawful or an unlawful procedure (Vin IV 153,21f., 24f., BD III 62).

464

Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation **(232)**

[has] acquittal due to [lacking] awareness (= 12. *awareness*),
 [is dependent on] intention (= 13. *intention*),
 [is] a fault according to common opinion (= 14. *fault*),
 [is] a physical deed, a verbal deed (= 15. *deeds*),
 [is done with an] unwholesome [type of] thought (= 16. *thought*),
 [with an] unpleasant [type of] feeling (= 17. *feeling*).

The commentary on the rule about going not having given
 [his] consent (proxy vote) is finished.

[11. The commentary on the rule about weak]

[81. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu, having given a robe [to an individual bhikkhu together] with a complete Saṅgha (i.e. as a member of a complete Saṅgha), later should engage in criticism [saying], “Bhikkhus are apportioning the Saṅgha’s gains according to acquaintanceship”, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 76,22–25 = Vin IV 154,19ff.)]

In the eleventh [rule], *with a complete Saṅgha (samaggena saṅghena, Pāt 76,22)* means: having given a robe together with a Saṅgha belonging to the same communion (*samānasāmavāsaka**), being established within the same boundary.¹

According to acquaintanceship (yathāsanthutam, Pāt 76,23), The meaning [is]: whoever is acquainted by virtue of [being] a friend (*mitta*), one seen together [with him] (*sandittha*), one with [whom he has] a meal together — to him.

An offence entailing] expiation (pācittiyam, Pāt 76,24) means: thus, having given a robe — he himself indeed, together with the Saṅgha — to a bhikkhu agreed upon as an assigner of lodgings, etc., there is [an offence entailing] expiation in each utterance for him criticising [this] later on.

¹ *samānasāmāyam thita* (see Kieffer-Pülz 1992: A Einl. 13); thus all *samāna-sāmavāsaka** members of the Saṅgha are within the same monastic boundary. Therefore, the bhikkhu who gives a robe is also part of that same Saṅgha whose activity he is criticising afterwards.

Page 513 job: 1272818

⟨233⟩ *Suddhapācittiya 81 M* 465

[This rule] was prescribed at Rājagaha (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “having given a robe [and] criticising [it] later” (= 3. *subject matter*).
 [The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).
 It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*). **⟨233⟩**
 There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation with regard to a lawful procedure.¹ It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one who, having given another requisite to be given away and to be shared out — apart from the robe — criticises [it] later.
 “[What] is to be given away and to be shared out”, means: the remainder, excluding the five heavy goods (*garu-bhaṇḍa**).²
 For by virtue of categories, five heavy goods are spoken of. There,
 (1) the first [category] is a monastery (*ārāma**),³ a site for a monastery (*ārāma-vatthu*);⁴
 (2) the second is a dwelling place (*vihāra*),⁵ a site for a dwelling place (*vihāra-vatthu*);⁶
 (3) the third is a bed (*mañca*),⁷ a seat (*pūṭha*),⁸ a bolster (*bhisi*),⁹ a

¹ Vin IV 155,6–9 (BD III 66).

² The five *garu-bhaṇḍa* are listed in the Cullavagga (Vin II 170,23–35, BD V 239), and in the following text here.

³ The commentary on the present passage refers it to various types of garden, Kkh-nṭ 422,1 = Sp VI 1237,6f.: *ārāmo* (Kkh 233,4) *nāma pupphārāmo vā phalārāmo vā*. “Ārāma means: a flower garden or a fruit garden.”

⁴ *ārāma-vatthu* (see CPD s.v. 1.); alternatively it can refer to the property of a park (CPD s.v. 2.).

⁵ Kkh-nṭ 422,4 = Sp VI 1237,9f.: *vihāro* (Kkh 233,5) *nāma kiñci pāsādādi senāsanam*. “Vihāra means: whatever lodging, such as a palace.”

⁶ Kkh-nṭ 422,4f. = Sp VI 1237,10: *vihāravatthu nāma tassa patiṭṭhānokāso*. “Vihāra-vatthu means: the place for its setting up.”

⁷ Kkh-nṭ 422,5ff. = Sp VI 1237,11ff.: *mañco* (Kkh 233,5) *nāma masārako bundikā-baddho, kuṭīrapādako, āhaccapādako ti imesam pubbe vuttānam catunnām mañcānam aññataro*. “Mañca means: one or other among the previously mentioned four [kinds of] beds: a bier-like bed, [a bed] with bound slats, [a bed] with curved legs, [a bed] with removable legs.”

⁸ Kkh-nṭ 422,7 = Sp VI 1237,13f.: *pūṭham* (Kkh 233,5) *nāma masārakādīnam yeva catunnām pūṭhānam aññatarām*. “One or other among the four [types] of seat such as a bier-like seat.”

⁹ Kkh-nṭ 422,8 = Sp VI 1237,14f.: *bhisi* (Kkh 233,5) *nāma uṇṇabhisīādīnam pañcānam bhisīnam aññatarā*. “Bolster means: one or other among the five [types] of bolsters such as one filled with wool.”

466 *Bhikkhupātimokkha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨233⟩

pillow (*bimbohana*):¹

(4) the fourth is a copper pot (*loha-kumbhī*),² a copper receptacle (*loha-bhāṇaka*),³ a copper jar (*loha-vāraka*),⁴ a copper vessel (*loha-kaṭāha*),⁵ an adze (*vāsi*), a hatchet (*parasu*), an axe (*kuṭhārī*), a hoe (*kudāla*), a spade (*nikhādana*);

(5) the fifth is a jungle rope, bamboo, coarse grass (*muñja*), reeds (*pabbaja*), *tīna* grass, clay, wooden goods, clay goods.

For these five properties of the Saṅgha, it is not suitable for the Saṅgha or a group or an individual to give [them] away or share [them] out. Even if they are given away and shared out, they belong only to the Saṅgha. But it is suitable to exchange through a lawful exchange an immovable thing (*thāvara*) for an immovable thing, and [it is suitable to exchange] something else considered beneficial for the Saṅgha for something else unlawful⁶ or⁷ lawful and of great value.⁸ It is suitable to

¹ Kkh-nṭ 422,8f. = Sp VI 1237,15f. *bibbohanam* (= Kkh 233,6) *nāma rukkhatūlalatātūla-poṭakitūlānam* *aññatarena puṇṇam*. “A pillow means: filled with one or other of cotton from trees (like the silk-cotton tree), cotton from creepers, cotton from grass.”

² Kkh-nṭ 422,9ff. = Sp VI 1237,16ff.: *lohakumbhī* (Kkh 233,6) *nāma kālalohena vā tambalohena vā yena kenaci lohena katā kumbhī*. “A metal pot means: a pot made of whatever metal, be it black metal (iron?) or red metal (copper).”

³ Kkh-nṭ 422,11f. = Sp VI 1237,17ff.: *lohabhāṇakādīsu pi es’ eva nayo. ettha pana bhāṇakan ti araṇjaro vuccati*. “Even with respect to a metal jar, etc., exactly this is the method. But here a jar is called *araṇjara*.”

⁴ Kkh-nṭ 422,12 = Sp VI 1237,19: *vārako ti* (= Kkh 233,6) *ghaṭo*. “A jar means: a jar.” Whereas *loha-kumbhī*, *loha-bhāṇaka*, and *loha-kaṭāha* are unanimously considered as *garu-bhāṇḍa* by tradition, opinions concerning the *loha-vāraka* varied. One that contained up to one *pāda** (it corresponds to between 2,250 gr. and 11,280 gr.) could be distributed in present-day Sri Lanka; therefore it was obviously not considered *garu-bhāṇḍa* there. For details, see Kieffer-Püllz 2013: III 2266.

⁵ Kkh-nṭ 422,12 = Sp VI 1237,19: *kaṭāham* (= Kkh 233,7) *kaṭāham eva*. “A vase means: it is precisely a vase.”

⁶ Kkh-nṭ 422,23f.: *akappiyenā ti* (Kkh 233,12) *suvaṇṇamayamañcādinā c’ eva akappiyabhisibibbohanehi ca*. “For something else unlawful means: for a bed, etc., consisting of gold and for unlawful bolsters and pillows.”

⁷ This is the reading of Kkh C^e (Kkh 233, n.13). Kkh E^e omits the *vā*.

⁸ Kkh-nṭ 422,24f.: *mahagghakappiyenā ti* (Kkh 233,13) *dantamayamañcādinā c’ eva pāvārādinā ca*. “For [something] lawful and of great value means: for a bed, etc., consisting of ivory and for a spreading [made of cotton], etc.”

⟨233⟩

Suddhapācittiya 81 M

467

give away inferior things for the sake of the protection of excellent lodgings, etc., and having given [them] away to use [things obtained from that exchange].¹

(1–3) And in the first three categories there [are] no [items] whatsoever that are called “non-heavy goods” (*a-garu-bhāṇḍa*).

(4) In the fourth category, [however], a metal pot (*loha-kumbhī*), a metal recepable (*loha-bhāṇḍaka*) that has the appearance of a jar (*arañjara*,² [and] a metal vessel (*loha-kaṭāha*),³—these three are heavy goods (*garu-bhāṇḍa**), even if they hold merely one *pasata*⁴ of water. But a metal jar (*loha-vāraka*), made from one or other of iron (black metal; *kāla-loha*), copper (red metal; *tamba-loha*), bronze (*kaṁsa-loha*), [or] brass (*vatṭa-loha*) may be shared out in Sīhaṇa-dīpa,⁴ [if it] holds one *pāda**,⁵ and one *pāda* means: it holds the capacity of five *nālis** [reckoned] according to the Magadha *nāli*.⁶ [136] [If it holds] more than that, it [counts as] heavy goods (*garu-bhāṇḍa**).⁷ These are first of all the metal vessels that are recorded in the text (i.e. in the Vinaya).

b–b ≠ Sp VI 1240,10–22

¹ Kkh-nṭ 424,22f.: *vissajjetvā paribhuñjituṁ vaṭṭati* ti (Kkh 233,15f.) *vissajjetvā tato laddhayāgubhattacīvaraḍīni paribhuñjituṁ vaṭṭati*. “Having given [them] away, it is suitable to use [them]: Having given [them] away, it is suitable to use rice gruel, meal, robes, etc., obtained therefrom.”

² The *arañjara*, also called *alañjala*, is a round water pot with a long beak-shaped spout. It seems to have been a vessel common in present-day Sri Lanka, see Kieffer-Püllz 2013: III 2262f.

³ One *pasata** corresponds to between about 151 gr. and 290 gr. Other vessels may be exchanged even if they contain 25, 30, or 40 *pasata*.

⁴ Present-day Sri Lanka.

⁵ This passage, which is quoted in Sp VI 1240,12ff. without the name of the source given, is identified as a quotation from the *Mahā-aṭṭhakathā* in Vmv II 246,3ff.

⁶ Five *Magadha-nālis** correspond to between 2,250 and 4,400 grams or 4,355 and 8,460 grams.

⁷ For a more detailed discussion of these vessels, their sizes, the material they are made of, and their implications for characterising a metal vessel as *garu-bhāṇḍa** or *lahu-bhāṇḍa*, see Kieffer-Püllz 2013: III [Z 417].

468

Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation ⟨234⟩

But even [metal vessels] not recorded in the text (i.e. the Vinaya), even small ones such as a water jug (*bhiṅgāra*),¹ vessels (*patiggaha*),² ladles (*ulūrīka*), spoons (*dabbī*), spoons (*kaṭacchu*),³ bowls (*pāti*), salvers (*taṭṭaka*), drinking vessels (*saraka*), baskets (*samugga*), pans for burning coal (*aṅgārakapalla*), censers,⁴ etc., are indeed heavy goods (*garubhanḍa**). But the [following] three may be shared out: an iron bowl (*ayapatta*), an iron dish (*ayathālaka*) [and] a red copper dish (*tambaloha-thālaka*).⁵ ⟨234⟩ A sort of vessel of brass (*kaṇṣa-loha*) or bronze (*vattā-loha*) is suitable either for use either according to a Saṅgha's use or [if] it is offered by a householder;⁶ it is not suitable for use according to an individual's use.^{-b}

c-But, apart from that variety of vessels, among other lawful metal goods, metal made firm in whatever way (*ghana-kata-loha*)⁷ [such as] an ointment box (*añjanī*), an ointment stick (*añjani-salakā*), a nose-dropper (*natthu-dāna*),⁸ an ear-wax remover (*kaṇṇa-mala-haraṇī*),⁹ a needle (*sūci*), a small pair of scissors (*khuddaka pippalika*),¹⁰ a small

c-^cSp VI 1240,25–41,11

¹ PED s.v. *bhiṅkāra*, Skt *bhrṅgāra*; this vessel is described in Vin-vn-ṭ II 302,19ff., as having a big aperture and a long neck.

² PED s.v. *patiggaha* refers to *patiṭṭhāha*; this entry has nothing to do with any type of vessel. *Pratigraha*, m., describes a vessel (NWS s.v.) or bowls for ill people, even spittoons (pw s.v. *pratigraha*, 8.).

³ A *kaṭacchu* is explained as being a *dabbi* (Abh 458).

⁴ *dhūma-kaṭacchu*, lit. a spoon for smoke; see DOP s.v. *dhūma*¹, s.v. °*kaṭacchu* “a spoon or ladle for (incense)-smoke; a censer (?)”.

⁵ From this it follows that these three are not heavy goods.

⁶ This passage is a quotation from the Mahāpaccarī which in this context is quoted as the authoritative source by Sp (VI 1240,21–25). For details, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: III [Z 417].

⁷ Kkh-nt 425,13ff.: *yathā tathā ghanakatam lohan ti* (Kkh 234,7) *lohavaṭṭi lohaguļo lohapiṇḍi lohacakkalikan ti evaṁ ghanakatam loham*. “In whatever way a metal is made firm means: a metal made firm thus: a metal protuberance (?), a metal ball, a metal lump, a metal ring.”

⁸ See DOP s.v.

⁹ CPD s.v. “an earpick”. DOP s.v. “an instrument to remove wax from the ear”.

¹⁰ Kkh-nt 425,12: *pippaliko ti* (Kkh 234,6) *kattari*. “*pippalika* means: scissors.”

Page 517 job: 1272818

⟨234⟩ *Suddhapācittiya 81 M* 469

penknife (*khuddaka ārakanṭaka*),¹ a key (*kuñcikā*), a key (*tāla*),² a bhikkhu's staff's (*kattara-yatṭhi*),³ a piercer (*vedhako*),⁴ a spear (*bhindi-vālaka*),⁵ and unfinished metal goods may all be shared out.

But a smoke-tube (*dhūma-netta*), a ploughshare (*phāla*), a lampstand (*dīpa-rukkha*),⁶ a bowl of an [oil] lamp (*dīpa-kapallikā*),⁷ a hanging lamp (*olambaka-dīpa*), or other [things] having the form of a woman, man or animal [which are] to be added to walls, roofs, door panels, etc., even including a metal peg, all metal goods are indeed heavy goods.

Those obtained by oneself, even having looked after them, are not to be used according to an individual's use, [but] they are suitable

¹ CPD s.v. *āra-kaṇṭaka* “lit. ‘the point of a needle’ ... ; a sort of instrument with a sharp point (penknife or style) for preparing manuscripts etc.”; DOP s.v. *ārā*¹ ““(a)-kaṇṭaka ... a small knife or pointed instrument (for preparing manuscripts).” Kkh-nṭ 425,¹²: *ārakanṭakan* (Kkh 234.6) *sūcivedhakam*. “A **pointed thorn** means: the perforating (?) of a needle (the bottleneck?).” Sv-pt II 257,^{16f}: *ārakanṭakan* *ti* *sūcivijjhana-kaṇṭakan*. “A **pointed thorn** [*ārakanṭakan*] means: a thorn perforating a needle.”

² On the various words for “key”, see von Hinüber 1992b: 16f.

³ CPD s.v. *kattara-yatṭhi* “a bhikkhu's staff”. For a study of the *kattara-danḍa*, *kattara-yatṭhi*, and the *khakkharaka*, see von Hinüber 1992b: 47ff.; 68ff.

⁴ Not in Childers or PED, but see pw s.v. *vedhaka* 1a) “Durchbohrer”; MW s.v. *vedhaka* “a piercer or perforator”. Perhaps a piercer attached to the tip of a stick? Kkh-nṭ 425,^{12f} understands *kattara-yatṭhi-vedhako* as one word and explains it by *kattara-yatṭhi-valayam*, “a ring of a *kattara* staff”. Following this explanation, we might suppose that *vedhaka* or *valaya* refers to a metal ring attached to such a staff in order to be able to make a noise with it. This would remind one of the *khakkhara* or monastic staff of the Mūlasarvāstivādin. For a study of the *khakkharaka*, see von Hinüber 1992b: 35ff.; 47ff.; 68ff.

⁵ BHSD s.v. *bhinḍipāla* “a kind of missile weapon”.

⁶ Literally a lamp tree, see DOP s.v. *dīpa-rukkha*, “a lamp on a stand; a lampstand”; see also MW s.v. *dīpa-vṛkṣa*. Cf. Mp-pt I 155,¹⁸–156,¹ ≠ Mp-nṭ II 183, *dīparukkhānan* *ti* (Mp I 185.6) *lohadantakaṭṭhamayānaṃ mahantānam dīparukkhānaṃ. lohādīmayesu* (Mp-nṭ *lohamayesu*) *pi hi tesu dīpādhāresu dīparukkhā* (Mp-nṭ ^orukkhakā) *ti rūlhiyo* (Mp-pt E^e for *rūlhiyā?*; Mp-pt B^e *rūlhi-r-esā*; Mp-nṭ *rūlhi-d-esā*) *daṭṭhabbā*. “**Of lamp trees** means: Of large lamp trees consisting of copper, ivory, or wood. For even concerning those lampstands consisting of copper, etc., they shall be shown as commonly spoken of as lamp trees (or: according to ordinary [language]).”

⁷ See DOP s.v. *dīpa*¹, ^o-*kapallikā*.

470 *Bhikkhupātimokkha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨234⟩

according to a Saṅgha's use or [as] offered by a householder. Even in the case of tin goods, exactly this is the method. Salvers and drinking vessels, etc., made of milkstone are indeed heavy goods.

But a jar (*ghataka*) or oil-vessel (*tela-bhājana*) are heavy goods only [if they are] above the holding capacity of one *pāda*. Vessels (*bhājana*) made from gold, silver, an alloyed metal (*ārakūṭa*), or natural crystal (?) *jāti-phalika*¹ are not suitable, even [if they] are offered by a householder.^{c d} But all [things — those] that may be touched and [those] that may not be touched — are suitable for the usage of a lodging.

But in respect of adzes² (*vāsi*), etc., with whatever adze it is not possible to do a large action other than merely cutting ivory or wood or trimming sugar cane, that may be shared out.^d The remainder, ^eby whatever means it was made, [counts as] heavy goods. But a hatchet (*parasu*) [and] even a doctors' vein-piercer (*sirāvedhako*) [count as] heavy goods; similarly an axe (*kuṭhārī*).

But what is considered under the category of weapons (*āvudha*), that is not to be touched. A hoe (*kudālo*)^{3 e} or a spade (*nikhādāna*)⁴ connected with a stick are heavy goods indeed.^{5 f} But a broom stick (*sammuñjanidānda*) as an instrument for digging (*khaṇanaka*) is indeed⁶ a mere blade

d–d Sp VI 1241,12–15 e–e Sp VI 1241,16–20 f–f Sp VI 1241,23–42,16

¹ Read *ārakūṭa-jātiphalika* for *ārakūṭajā tiphalika* (Kkh 234,17).

² The translation of *vāsi* by "adze" is the most common so far. The fact that the instrument *vāsi* here is used for cutting ivory, wood, or sugar cane renders it likely that a smaller instrument is meant here, possibly a sharp knife.

³ Kkh-nt 425,21: *kudālo* (Kkh 234,24) *antamaso caturaṅgulamatto pi garubhaṇḍam eva*. "A hoe, even one of merely four *aṅgula* (about 7.2 cm) [counts] indeed [as] heavy goods."

⁴ Kkh-nt 425,21–24: *nikhādanam* (Kkh 234,25) *caturassamukham vā hotu, doṇi-mukham vā vaṇkaṇ vā ujukam vā, antamaso sammuñjanidaṇḍakavedhanam pi daṇḍabandham ce, garubhaṇḍam eva. tenāha "kudālo daṇḍabandhani-khādanam vā agarubhaṇḍam nāma natthī" ti* (Kkh 234,25). "A spade, whether it has a square surface, or a trough[-like] surface (that is, with two sides bent in) or is crooked or straight, even a perforation in a stick of a fist broom, if it is connected with a stick [counts as] heavy goods indeed. Therefore he says, 'A hoe or a spade connected with a stick are heavy goods indeed.'"

⁵ Literally "are by no means not-heavy goods".

⁶ This passage is handed down in various texts, and everywhere with *eva*. In the present context, *iva* would be more likely.

⟨235⟩

Suddhapācittiya 81 M

471

(*phala*) without a hilt (*adaṇḍaka*); whatever can be carried around, having thrown it into a small case, that may be shared out. Even the point of a sword (*sikhara*) is included by a spade (*nikhādana*) indeed.¹ By whatever men are given adzes, etc., ⟨235⟩ in respect of a dwelling (*vihāra*), if they say, when a house is burned down or plundered, “Give us, sirs, tools, we shall bring them back”, they are to be given. If they take them away, they are not to be restrained; even if they do not bring them back, they are not to be revoked.

Anvils, hammers, tongs, scales, etc., all instruments made of metal by smiths (*kammāra*), mat-makers (*tatṭa-kāra*), turners (*cunda-kāra*), basket makers (*nalakāra*), jewellers (*mani-kāra*), [and] bowl knotters (*patta-bandhaka*), count as heavy goods from the time of being given to the Saṅgha. Even in respect of the instruments of tinsmiths, goldsmiths, and leather workers exactly this is the method. But the [following] is the difference: in respect of the instruments of tinsmiths, a knife for cutting tin; in respect of the instruments of goldsmiths, a knife for cutting gold; in respect of the instruments of leatherworkers, a small knife for cutting leather when the preparation has been done — these may be shared out. Even in respect of the instruments of barbers and tailors, except for large shears, [137] large tweezers, and large scissors, everything is suitable; the other things [count as] heavy goods.

But in respect of creepers (*valli*), etc., whatever cane (*vetta*), creeper, etc., is the size of half an arm, or whatever creeper is either given to the Saṅgha or growing there guarded and protected indeed, [that counts as] heavy goods; that, if it is surplus when work for the Saṅgha or work for the *cetiya* has been done, it is suitable to present even for the work of an individual.^f

g—Ropes (*rajjuka*) or cords² (*yotta*) — [both] consisting of threads (*sutta*), fibres (*makaci*), barks (*vāka*), sheafs of coconut [fibres] (*nāli-kerahīra*) [and] hides (*camma*), made by twisting barks and sheafs of coconut [fibres], —either as one with a single twist or with a double twist —that are] the property of the Saṅgha, [count as] heavy goods. But

^g—gSp VI 1242,17–29

¹ Read *nikhādanen’ eva* for *nikhādane n’ eva* (Kkh 234,28).

² According to Vmv (II 246,22) these are cords of hides (*cammarajjukā*).

472

Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation

⟨236⟩

thread [that was] given, not having twisted it, and fibres, barks, [as well as] sheafs of coconut [fibres], may be shared out. But whoever gave these ropes, etc., if they carry them off for their own business, [they] are not to be restrained.

Whatever bamboo (*velu*) — even one having the measure of a needle-stick eight fingers [in length] — either given to the Saṅgha or growing there guarded and protected, [that counts as] heavy goods. That, too, if it is surplus when the work for the Saṅgha or the work for the *cetiya* has been done, it is suitable to give for the work of an individual. But an oil tube (*tela-nāli*) holding a *pāda*, a bhikkhu's staff (*kattara-yatthi*),¹ a footwear stick (*upāhana-dandaka*),² an umbrella handle (*chatta-danda*), [or] an umbrella rib (*chatta-salākā*), these are in this context goods that may be shared out. Men whose houses have burned down, who take them and go off are not to be restrained.^{-g} ⟨236⟩

^{h-h}Coarse grass (*muñja*) and reeds (*pabbaja*) and the remaining thatching grass even the size of a fist (*muñthi**), among palm-leaves, etc., whatsoever comes under the category of thatching grass, even a single leaf, either given to the Saṅgha or growing there or growing outside the monastery in a grass site belonging to the Saṅgha, guarded and protected, [that counts as] heavy goods. That too, if it is surplus when the work for the Saṅgha or the work for the *cetiya* has been done, it is suitable to give for the work of an individual. Men whose houses have burned down who take them and go off are not to be restrained. An empty book (or: manuscript; *ritta-potthaka*),³ even eight fingers in size (ca. 14.4 cm), [counts as] heavy goods indeed.

^{h-h}Sp VI 1243,4-23

¹ See above, p. 469, n. 3.

² CPD understands *upāhana-dandaka* as the peg coming between the big toe and the next (see CPD s.v.). This meaning is unlikely in the present list, since here, different types of sticks are listed, but not various parts of a shoe. Cone gives the meaning “a sandal-stick (for carrying them?)” (DOP s.v. *upāhanā*). For *upāhanā*, see below, p. 537, n. 2.

³ Explained in Vin-vn-t (II 308,2ff.) as an empty book/manuscript, namely one free from script or one not written in (*lekhāhi suññapotthako, na likhitapotthako*); Vmv II 246,24f. has *alikhitapotthaka*.

Clay (*mattikā*)¹ whether it is natural clay or of five colours, or plaster (*sudhā*); or, among resins (*sajjurasa*)² mineral substances (*kaṅgutṭha*)³ gums,⁴ etc., whatever, having been brought to a place [where it is] hard to find [it], has been given [to the Saṅgha] or, growing there guarded and protected, [if it is of] the size of a palm-fruit [it] is [counted as] heavy goods. That too, if it is surplus when the work for the Saṅgha or the work for the *cetiya* has been done, it is suitable to give for the work of an individual. But asafœtida (*hiṅgu*)⁵ vermillion (*hiṅkulaka*)⁶ yellow orpiment (*hari-tāla*)⁷ red arsenic (*manosila*)⁸ collyrium (*añjana*)⁹ etc., may be shared out.

In respect of wooden goods, whatever wooden goods, having the size spoken of in respect of bamboo,¹⁰ either given to the Saṅgha or

¹ Khuddas-nṭ shows that *mattikā* also covers plaster (*sudhā*) and *kaṅgutṭha*, etc. (Khuddas-nṭ 391,22f.: *sudhākaṅgutṭhādayo mattikaggahañena gahitā*).

² PED s.v. *sajjalasa* “resin”. Skt *sarjarasa*; according to Hoernle 1908 “resin of shorea robusta, Säl tree” (NWS s.v. *sarjarasa*).

³ C^e *kuṇkuṭṭha*; Skt *kāṅkuṣṭha*; other forms are *kaṅkuṭṭha*, *kaṅkuṭṭhaka*, *kukkuṭṭha*, *kukkuṭṭhaka*, for all of which DOP gives “earth or plaster of a golden or silver colour”; according to NWS s.v. *kaṅkuṣṭha*, this term comprises four substances, two of mineral origin, two of animal origin. For further information, see there [b] and [c].

The only commentary to comment on it is Khuddas-nṭ 391,23f. which does not illuminate the *kaṅgutṭha*, however, but what is included by ādi: *kaṅgutṭha-ādikā ti* (Khuddas B^e v. 327, E^e 40.6) *ādi-saddena sajjurasa-jātihiṅkulakādīnam gahanam*. “**Kaṅgutṭha**, etc.: by the word ‘etc.’ [there is the] inclusion of resin, natural vermillion, etc.”

⁴ *silesa*; not in Childers; PED, only in meaning “junction, embracing”, etc. The commentaries explain it as a sticky sap leaking out of leaves, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II 1437, n. 15.

⁵ Various products are made from asafœtida; for *hiṅgu*, *hiṅgu-jatu*, etc., see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 227].

⁶ PED s.v. *hiṅkulaka*.

⁷ PED s.v. *hari*, -*tāla*.

⁸ Childers s.v. *manosilā*.

⁹ CPD s.v. *añjana*.

¹⁰ In Sp VI 1243,20, which is different from the present Kkh passage, the size is also mentioned as a needle-stick eight fingers [in length]. Kkh 236,14 omits this here, and instead refers to the explanations made in connection with the bamboo. Actually, Sp VI 1242,23ff., concerning the bamboo, also gives the size with a needle-stick eight fingers [in length], and this passage is also rendered in Kkh 235,22f., see above, p. 472. Thus the reference goes to this passage.

474 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* **〈236〉**

growing there guarded and protected, [that counts as] heavy goods.^{1-h} Moreover, ⁱall kinds of wood, bamboo, leather, stone, etc., are included by the [term] wooden goods.²⁻ⁱ There, all sitting places (*āsana*) not included in³ [the terms] beds (*mañca*) and seats (*pīṭha*), such as a rectangular seat (*āsandikā*),⁴ beginning even with a seat made from rags or straw or leaves, [count as heavy goods].⁵

^j-A curved slab (*vāṇka-phalaka*), a long slab (*dīgha-phalaka*), a slab for washing clothes, a beating slab (*ghaṭṭana-phalaka*), a beating club (*ghaṭṭana-muggara*),⁶ a block (*gaṇṭhikā*) for splitting ivory and wood,⁷ a

i-i Sp VI 1243,24f. j-j Sp VI 1244,4-28

¹ This statement, which is slightly different in wording, is characterized as a quotation from the Kurundī in Sp VI 1243,20-23. The commentary Kkh-nt 426,24 also refers to this fact.

² In Sp VI 1243,23 this sentence is marked as a quotation from the Mahā-āṭhakathā. The end of the quotation is not marked unless we assume that this quotation stretches to Sp VI 1245,17, where a *ti* marks the end of a quotation. But possibly the end is in Sp VI 1244,4.

³ Reading *mañcapīṭhe* with C^e for E^e *mañcapīṭhehi*.

⁴ *āsandika*, a square seat. In Sp (VI 1216,16: *āsandiko ti caturassapīṭham vuccati*) the *āsandika* is listed as a special type of seat (*pīṭha*), see below, p. 490. But it is a little strange that the *āsandika* is listed here as an article of furniture for sitting and is not included by the terms *mañca* or *pīṭha*.

⁵ If one understands this sentence to be connected to the next paragraph, then the characterization as “heavy goods” is valid also for these seats. That this is the case is visible from the respective sentence in Sp VI 1243,24-44,1.

⁶ See Appendix 40.

⁷ *dantakaṭṭhachedana-gaṇṭhikā*; for *gaṇṭhikā* DOP (s.v. *gaṇṭhikā*) gives three meanings: 1. a knot, a bunch; 2. a button, a toggle (fastened by a loop, *pāsaka*); 3. an executioner’s block. We here have assumed the third meaning since the word appears as something to cut ivory and wood on or with. Since in case of the executioner’s block (*dhamma-gaṇḍikā*, *°gaṇṭhikā*, *°gandhikā*) a *gaṇṭhikā* describes the place on which hand and feet are cut off (*hatthapādachindanakanā* *gaṇḍikā*; see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 812), it there describes the place on which the cutting is carried out, not the instrument. See also DOP s.v. *gaṇḍi*, *gandikā*.

⟨236⟩

Suddhapācittiya 81 M

475

stick mallet (*danda-muggara*),¹ a trough (*nāvā*),² a cisterne (*ambana*),³ a dyeing vat (*rajanadoni*), a water-receiver [vessel] (*udaka-pāticchaka*),⁴ a box (*samugga*),⁵ both with feet and without feet, either made of wood or made of ivory or made of bamboo, a casket (*mañjūsā*),⁶ a box (*karaṇḍa*)⁷ of a measure larger than the holding capacity of one *pāda**, a water-trough (*udaka-donī*),⁸ a water jar (*udakakaṭāha*),⁹ a ladle (*ulūṅka*), a spoon (*kaṭacchu*), a cup for [drinking] water, a conchshell for

¹ Kkh-nṭ 427,5f.: *danḍamuggaro* (Kkh 236,20) *nāma yena rajitacīvaraṇ pothenti*.

“A stick mallet means: by which they beat the dyed robe.” For other explanations of *danḍa-muggara*, see Kieffer-Püllz 2013: I 733. Vin-vn v. 2885 instead lists *bhaṇḍikā muggaro c’ eva* “device (?) and club”.

² Actually a boat, a ship, or a trough (DOP s.v.) Given the items listed here, a trough probably is the more probable assumption.

³ Kkh C^e *ammaṇam*; CPD s.v. *ambana* “a trough, a certain measure of capacity”. DOP s.v. *ammaṇa* “a wooden vessel, a trough”; following the commentaries, this seems to be a type of cisterne or water tank. Kkh-nṭ 427,6f. = Sp-t III 405,8 = Vin-vn-t II 310,9f.: *ambanān ti* (Kkh 236,21 = Sp VI 1244,7, Vin-vn v. 2885) *phalakehi pokkharanīṣadisam katapāṇīyabhājanām*. “*Ambanān* means: A vessel for drinking water made like an artificial pool with boards.” Vmv II 247,2ff.: *ambanān ti* (Sp VI 1244,7) *ekadonpiṇāvāphalakehi pokkharanīṣadisam kataṁ pāṇīyabhājanān ti pi vadanti*. “*Ambanān* means: made like an artificial water pool with boards from one vat [or] a boat. Some say too: a vessel for drinking water.”

⁴ v.l. °*pacchiko*; probably the same as °*pāticchanna*, °*pātiggāhaka*.

⁵ That the information according to material and feet belong to the following item, that is, the *samugga*, not to the preceding, the *udaka-pāticchaka*, is obvious from Kkh-pṭ 103,15f., where these elements are quoted together as a reading.

⁶ “A casket; used for keeping important documents in” (PED s.v.); Sp II 453,21 in connection with Pār 3 M states that it does not suffice to guard manuscripts that praise death and thus lead to bhikkhus committing suicide by putting them in a casket, if others see it; in Pāc-y 41,4 *mañjūsā* is explained as *peṭā* “a (large) basket” (PED s.v.). For suicide in the Vinaya, see Delhey 2006: 29–32; Anālayo 2014: 11–55 [2017: 69–112].

⁷ CPD s.v. *‘karaṇḍa* “(small) wickerwork box (with a lid)”. DOP s.v. *karaṇḍa* “a covered box or basket (of bamboo); ...”

⁸ CPD s.v. “a wooden vessel for holding or pouring out water”; DOP s.v. *donī* “1. a wooden trough or tub; a trough; 2. a trough-shaped boat...”.

⁹ Allowed as a vessel to fetch water from a well (Vin II 122,25). According to CPD s.v. *kaṭāha*, it is “a pot or pan (of a semi-spheroidal shape and with handles)”.

476 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨237⟩

[drinking] water¹ — among these, whatever is given to the Saṅgha [counts as] heavy goods. But a plate of mother-of-pearl (*saṅkhatālaka*) may be shared out, [138] similarly a water vessel (*udakatumba*)² made of wood. A stand for a foot-scraper (*pāda-kathalikamāṇḍala*)³ whether made of wood or made of rags or leaves, etc., all ⟨237⟩ [counts as] heavy goods. A stand (*ādhāraka*)⁴, a bowl-cover (*patta-pidhāna*), a palm-leaf [used as a] fan (*tālavanta*)⁵, a fan (*vibijani*)⁶, a box (*carigotaka*)⁷, a basket (*pacchi*)⁸, a stick-broom (*yatthi-sammūñjanī*)⁹, a fist broom (*muṭṭhi-sammūñjanī*)¹⁰, even among these, whatever is small or large [and] is made with whatever [material] among wood, bamboo, leaves, hides, etc., [they count as] heavy goods indeed.

¹ *pāṇīya-sarāva pāṇīya-saṅkha*; both are allowed Vin II 153,24f. (BD V 215).

² CPD s.v. “a water-flask, water-vessel (for carrying water along with); 2. a drain-pipe”. Since the allowance to share out the *udaka-tumba* is restricted to one made from wood, it obviously was made from other materials too.

³ DOP s.v. *kathalakā*, “pebbles, gravel; a potsherd; a scraper”. Since here the *pāda-kathalika-māṇḍala* can be made of wood, cloth, leaves, etc., the first three meanings given for *kathalikā* are to be excluded. The *pāda-kathalikā* belongs to those things bhikkhus have to prepare for welcoming incoming bhikkhus to clean their feet (Vin I 175,26–33), that is, a kind of scrubber (see CPD s.v. *kathalikā*; see also von Hinüber 1996b: 112 [2009: I 244]). *Māṇḍala* is used among other meanings in the sense of “stand” in *patta-māṇḍala* “stand for a bowl” (allowed Vin II 112,29). It is to be assumed that here, too, *māṇḍala* has this meaning.

⁴ CPD s.v. “a stand or stool”; DOP s.v. “a support; a holder, a stand”. Since the *ādhāraka* here is followed by a *patta-pidhāna*, it is probable that a stand for an alms bowl (*pattā-dhāraka*, allowed Vin II 113,25f.) is meant.

⁵ DOP s.v. *tāla °-vanṭa* “a palm-leaf used as a fan; a fan in general”; probably a large fan moved via a rope.

⁶ Vin II 130,24 three types of fans are differentiated, made of bark (*vāka-maya*), made of the *usīra* root, or made of a peacock’s tail (PED s.v. *vijanī*).

⁷ DOP s.v. “a box or basket (often of bamboo, or of gold, esp. for flowers), a trug.”

⁸ Used to transport leaves, flowers, charcoal (*aṅgāra°*), boiled rice, etc.

⁹ Bound from two or three sticks (*dāṇḍa*) and small sticks (*salākā*; Sp VI 1231,23f.).

¹⁰ Made from the same material as the *yatthi-sammūñjanī*, but with five or six sticks, see n. 1869.

In respect of pillars (*thambha*), beams (*tulā*), staircases (*sopana*), boards (*phalaka*), etc., whatever is made of wood or made of stone is fit as the materials for a house; whatever grass mat (*kaṭa-sāraka*),¹ whatever ground covering (*bhūmattharana*), whatever unlawful skin (*akappiya-camma*) there is, all that, belonging to the Saṅgha, [counts as] heavy goods; it is suitable to make [them] a ground covering. But a goat skin goes under the label of covering. That too [counts as] heavy goods indeed. Lawful skins are to be shared out. But in the Kurundī it is said that every skin the size of a bed [counts as] heavy goods.

A mortar (*udukkhala*), a pestle (*musala*), a winnowing basket (*suppa*), a grindstone (*nisada*), a mill-stone (*nisada-pota*), a stone trough (*pāsāṇa-doni*), a stone vessel (*pāsāṇa-kaṭāha*), even all ploughing implements [count as] heavy goods. Every vehicle attached to wheels [counts as] heavy goods indeed.^{-j}

^k—The feet and rails² of beds and seats, and the handles of adzes, axes, etc. — among these, whatever is not finished may be shared out, but [anything] fashioned and smoothed is heavy goods.

The handle (*danḍa*) of a permitted adze (*vāsi*),³ an umbrella (*chatta*), a [palmyra palm] leaf [grasped with the] fist (*muṭṭhi-paṇṇa*),⁴ a bhikkhu's staff,⁵ footwear,⁶ fire implements (*araṇisahita*), a water-vessel [with a

^{k-k}Sp VI 1245,1-17

¹ CPD s.v. “a kind of grass mat; according to cty. (v. infra) ~ is made from one of four types of grass: *eragu*, *moragu*, *majāru*, or *jantu*”.

² The rails (*ataṇiyo*) which form the frame of the bed.

³ Kkh-nṭ 427,13f. = Pālim-nṭ II 161,21f.: *anuññātavāsi nāma yā sipāṭikāya pakkhipitvā pariharitum sakkā ti vuttā*. “[That] is called a permitted adze which one can carry about having placed it into a case.” Similar Khuddas-pṭ 180,6f.; see also Pāc-y 496,4f. *anuññātavāsiyā ti* (Sp VI 1245,4) *bhājanatthāya anuññātavāsiyā*.

⁴ Kkh-nṭ 427,14f.: *muṭṭhipaṇṇan ti* (Kkh 237,18) *tālapattam. tañ hi muṭṭhinā gahetvā pariharantī ti muṭṭhipaṇṇan ti vuccati.* “**muṭṭhipaṇṇan** ti (Kkh 237,18) *chattacchadanapaṇṇam evā*” ti keci. “**muṭṭhipaṇṇan**” means: a leaf of the palmyra tree. For having grasped this with the fist they carry [it] about; [that] is called a *muṭṭhipaṇṇa*. *muṭṭhipaṇṇan* means: it is just a leaf for covering the roof, some [say].”

⁵ *kattara-yatthi*; see above, p. 469, n. 3.

⁶ *upāhanā*; see below, p. 537, n. 2.

478 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨237⟩

straining arrangement] (*dhamma-karana*),¹ a vessel [made] from myrobalan (*āmalaka-tumba*)² not exceeding the holding capacity of one *pāda*, a jar [made] from myrobalan (*āmalaka-ghaṭa*),³ a gourd vessel (*lābuka-tumba*), a gourd jar (*lābuka-ghaṭa*), a horn vessel (*visāṇa-tumba*), all of this may be shared out; other than this [counts as] heavy goods.

Ivory (*hatthi-danta*) or whatever horn (*visāṇa*), unworked, only as it came, may be shared out. In respect of the feet, etc., of beds and seats, made from them (i.e. from ivory or horn), the regulation is exactly as before. Even if worked and finished, an asafoetida box (*hiṅgu-karaṇḍaka*), an ointment box (*añjani-karaṇḍaka*), a block (*gaṇṭhikā*),⁴ a buckle (*vidha*),⁵ an ointment box (*añjanī*), an ointment stick (*añjani-salākā*), a water-wiper (*udaka-puñchanī*),⁶ all this may be shared out indeed.

¹ C^e °*karako*; DOP s.v. *dhamma*, °-*karka*: “a water-vessel (with a strainer)”.
² *āmalaka* is the plant *Phyllanthus emblica* (also Indian gooseberry, malacca, or amla tree) or its fruit (DOP s.v.). Probably the vessel is made from the wood of the tree.
³ A *ghaṭa* is a pitcher, a pot, esp. for water; a large water-jar (DOP s.v.).

⁴ In Vin II 136,27f. a *gaṇṭhikā* is allowed for weighting the bhikkhus’ robes in order to prevent them from being blown up by the wind. Such blocks may not be made of silver or gold, but of bone, ivory, horn, reed, bamboo, wood, lac, crystal, copper, centre of a conch-shell, of threads. Vjb 529,3 = Pālim-ṇt II 158,3 explain it by *cīvara-gaṇṭhikā*, “robes’ blocks”.

⁵ Allowed in Vin II 136,16; it may be made of the same materials as the *gaṇṭhikā* (Vin II 136,21f.). Pālim-ṇt II 158,4: *vidho ti* (Pālim 308,27) *kāya-bandhana-vidho*, “a buckle for a girdle”.

⁶ Von Hinüber 1999: n. 144 “Gerät zum Wasserabschaben”; since this instrument belongs to the items made of bone, ivory, or horn, it cannot be a towel (so BD III 89; but see IBH’s comment, BD V 169, n. 5). Sp VI 1208,12ff.: *udakapuñchanī ti dāṇḍamayāpi visāṇamayāpi dārumayāpi vattati, tassā asati colakenāpi udakam paccuddharitum vattati*. “**Udaka-puñchanī** means: one consisting of a stick, consisting of horn, and one consisting of wood is suitable; in its absence it is suitable to wipe off the water even with a rag.” In the Vinaya, however, it seems as if it is permissible to wipe the water wiper with a rag (Vin II 122,36f.: *anujānāmi, bhikkhave, udakapuñchanīm colakenāpi paccuddharitum ti*. “I allow, bhikkhus, to wipe the water wiper even with a rag.” IBH’s translation — “I allow, bhikkhus, a wiper [with which to wipe off] the water and to sponge yourselves down with a cloth” (BD V 169) — is far from the text, but was inspired by the information that the bhikkhus’ limbs cooled down).

⟨238⟩ In respect of clay goods, everything which is of profit and use for men, potter's vessels, such as pots, receptables [for the wooden cleaning chip] (*pīthara*),¹ etc., a pot for leaves (*patta-kaṭāha*),² a pan for burning coals (*aṅgāra-kaṭāha*), a censer (*dhūma-dānakā*),³ a lampstand (*dīpa-rukkhaka*),⁴ a bowl of an [oil] lamp (*dīpa-kappallikā*),⁵ a building brick (*cayaniṭṭhakā*),⁶ a roofing brick [tile] (*chadaniṭṭhakā*),⁷ dome material (*thupikā*),⁸ — all [count as] heavy goods.^{9–k} But by one taking whatever bamboo, etc., among these heavy goods of the stated sorts for himself, it is to be taken performing compensation work¹⁰ of equal or greater [value].

^a—But a jar (*ghataka*)¹¹ of a size not exceeding the holding capacity of one *pāda**, a bowl (*patta*), a dish (*thālaka*), a *kañcanaka* vessel,¹² a water-pot (*kunḍikā*),¹³ this may be shared out here. And as in the case of clay goods, so in the case of copper goods too a water-pot (*kunḍikā*)

^a—a Sp VI 1245,18–22

¹ Vin-vn-t II 327,3: *avalekhanakaṭṭhanikkhepanabhājanam*. “A vessel for depositing the wooden chip for cleaning.”

² According to Vmv II 247,9f. a pot for cooking leaves (*patta-pañcana-kaṭāha*).

³ Similar to a *dhūma-kaṭacchu*?; see above, p. 468, n. 4.

⁴ Identical with the *dīpa-rukkha*?; see above, p. 469, n. 6.

⁵ See above, p. 469, n. 7.

⁶ See DOP s.v. *cayana*, °-*iṭṭhakā*, “brick for building a platform?”

⁷ See DOP s.v. *cayana*, °-*iṭṭhakā*.

⁸ See DOP s.v. *thūpikā*, “a small turret, a pinnacle; ... or a small stūpa?”

⁹ In Sp VI 1245,17f. this list of items is said to be heavy goods once they have been given to the Saṅgha. This involves the fact that before being given to the Saṅgha they are not necessarily heavy goods.

¹⁰ *phātikammaṇi katvā*; it is allowed in the Vinaya to barter costly rugs or pieces of cloths for the sake of making increase (*phāti-kamma*) for the Saṅgha (Vin II 174,20, 24). As the barter must include receiving at least equal value, a bhikkhu must make compensation for any amount received that is less than that. See also the discussion in Vibh-a 334,7ff. (DD II 57).

¹¹ See above, p. 470.

¹² CPD s.v. *kañcanaka*, “a kind of vessel or bottle”, refers to the fact that the translation as “rosary” is erroneous. The *kañcanaka* is listed together with the *kuṇḍiyā* and the *karodiyā* in Jain parallels, see von Hinüber 1992b: 56 and n. 94.

¹³ DOP s.v. “a water-pot (used by ascetics and brahmans).” For more details, see Coomaraswamy 1928: 262 s.v. *kunḍikā*.

480 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨238⟩

falls to the share which may be shared out.^{1-a} Whatever is to be shared out or even to be given away, having thus given for that another requisite counted as to be given away and to be shared out, [then] criticizing [it] later, there is [an offence of] wrong doing.² But it is not suitable to simply give another thing. Someone giving because of [arrogated] power of disposal³ commits a gross offence. Someone taking with a thought of theft is to be dealt with, having valued the goods.⁴ And as there is [an offence of] wrong doing for one criticising, having given another requisite, so there is [an offence of] wrong doing indeed for one criticising, having given a robe or other requisite to one not agreed upon by the Saṅgha.⁵ There is a triple [offence of] wrong doing under all circumstances in respect of one who is unordained⁶ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).⁷

There is no offence for one criticising, having seen one acting usually by virtue of desire, etc., [thinking.] [139]^{b-c} “What need of giving to him. Even having received it, he will not make proper use of it”,^b and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

b–b Vin IV 155,19ff.

¹ The *iti* (Kkh 238,9) indicates the end of this sentence. It also concludes the corresponding sentence in Sp VI 1245,22 from which Kkh borrowed it, and also in Pālim (309,5) where it is taken over from Sp too. The *iti* concludes the examples before the words *ayam ettha anupubbikathā*. “This is the gradual instruction here.” In the various editions of Kkh (E^e B^e C^e) the *iti* is put at the beginning of the following sentence. This probably happened because the following words of Sp were not taken over to Kkh, and thus there was no immediate explanation for such an *iti*. In the light of the borrowing from Sp, this reading, however, does not seem to be the original one. We took the *iti* here as the conclusion of the sentence.

² Kkh 238,12 starts a new paragraph thereafter, although the next sentences belong to this context too.

³ Von Hinüber 1979: 277 [English translation, 1994: 116–19]; DOP s.v. has taken up von Hinüber’s explanations. CPD s.v., wrongly, “arrogance, overbearingness”.

⁴ Kkh 238,15 starts a new paragraph thereafter, although this still belongs to the present section.

⁵ Kkh 238,17 has a comma, but the sentence stops here.

⁶ Vin IV 155,13–16 (BD IV 66).

⁷ Kkh 238,18 continues with the following sentence, but here a new paragraph starts.

⟨239⟩

Suddhapācittiya 83 M

481

These are the four constituent factors here: (i) being ordained, (ii) the agreement that it was received lawfully, (iii) giving a robe fit for assignment [together] with the Saṅgha, (iv) the criticism because of the desire to criticise later (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] taking what is not given (Pār 2 M),

but here [the offence against] this [rule is done with an] unpleasant [type of] feeling (= 17. *feeling*).

The commentary on the rule about weak is finished.

[12. The commentary on the rule about apportioning]

[82. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should knowingly apportion to a person an apportioned property belonging to the Saṅgha, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 78,2–3 = Vin IV 156,18f.)] ⟨239⟩

In the twelfth [rule] ^c—everything is exactly in the manner stated in the rule about apportioning in the thirtieth section¹ (Niss 30 M). Only this indeed is the difference. There, because of [it] being apportioned to oneself, it was [an offence entailing] expiation with forfeiture (i.e. *nissaggiya-pācittiya*); here, because of [it] being apportioned to [another] person, it is a simple [offence entailing] expiation (i.e. *suddhikā-pācittiya*).^c

The commentary on the rule about apportioning is finished.

The section about legitimately, the eighth.

[i. The section about treasures]

[1. The commentary on the rule about the bedchamber]

[83. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu, not announced beforehand, should cross over the [bedchamber] threshold of a khattiya king, who has been*

^c—cSp IV 880,9–12

¹ This refers to Niss 30, which forms the last rule of the third Nissaggiya section, and is called a *pariṇāma* rule. Why this section is called *timsaka-kande* here, remains unclear.

482 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨239⟩

anointed on the head, when the king has not departed and the [queen-] treasure has not withdrawn, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.
 (Pāt 78,7–9 = Vin IV 160,14ff.)

In the first [rule] of the section about treasures of a *khattiya* (*khattiyyassa*, Pāt 78,7) means: of one who is a *khattiya* by birth.

d—*Of one anointed on the head (muddhābhisittassa, Pāt 78,7)* means: of one anointed on the head (resolution of compound) with a *khattiya* anointing.

The king has not gone out from there, [that is] when the king has not departed. In that sleeping room *when the king has not departed* (*anikkhanta-rājake*, Pāt 78,8), [that is the] meaning.^{-d}

The queen is called “a treasure” (*ratana*). “Not withdrawn” (*niggata*) means: not gone out. “When the [queen-]treasure has not withdrawn” means: The [queen-]treasure has not withdrawn from there; In that sleeping room *with the [queen-]treasure not withdrawn* (*aniggataratanake*, Pāt 78,8).

Should cross over the [bedchamber] threshold (indakhīlam atikkameyya, Pāt 78,9) means: Here, there is [an offence of] wrong doing for one making the first footprint cross the threshold of the sleeping room not having made known his own arrival [beforehand. For one making] the second footprint [cross] there is [an offence entailing] expiation. [This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the venerable Ānanda (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “entering the king’s bedchamber” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking he is not announced when he is announced, and for one who is in doubt² (= 6. [sorts of] *offence*).

There is no offence for one who thinks he is announced [when he is announced],³ or [if] it is not a *khattiya*’s [bedroom], or [if] he is not

d—d Sp IV 880,28–81,3

¹ Vin IV 160,32–34 (BD III 76).

² Vin IV 160,35f. (BD III 76).

³ Vin IV 160,36f. (BD III 76).

|⟨240⟩

Suddhapācittiya 84 M

483

|⟨240⟩ anointed with a *khattiya* anointing, or for one who enters the
|bedroom when both have departed or one or other of the two have
|departed, when it is not a bedroom, and for one who is insane, etc. (=
|7. *non-offence*).

| These are the five constituent factors here: (i) being a *khattiya*,
|(ii) being anointed, (iii) neither of them having withdrawn from the
|bedroom, (iv) not being announced, (v) crossing over the threshold (=
|9. *constituent factors*).

| The origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., are the same as for the first
| *kathina* [rule] (Niss 1 M),

| but [the offence against] this [rule originates in] activity and inactivity (= 11. *activity*).

| The commentary on the rule about the bedchamber is finished.

| [2. The commentary on the rule about treasures]

| [84. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should take up or have taken up a treasure or what is reckoned as a treasure, unless [it is] in a monastery or in a dwelling place, there is [an offence entailing] expiation. But having taken up or having had taken up a treasure or what is reckoned a treasure in a monastery or in a dwelling place, it is to be deposited by a bhikkhu [thinking], “He to whom it belongs will take it.” This is the proper course here.*]

| (Pāt 78,11–16 = Vin IV 163,13–18)]

| In the second [rule] *treasure* (*ratanam*, Pāt 78,11) means: the tenfold [treasure consisting in] pearls, etc.¹

| *Reckoned as a treasure* (*ratanasammataṁ*, Pāt 78,11) means: whatever is of enjoyment and of use to people.

| *In a monastery or* (*ajjhārāme vā*, Pāt 78,14) means: inside the enclosure of an enclosed [monastery], inside two stones' throws of one which is not enclosed.²

¹ The “etc.” according to the commentary (Kkh-nṭ 428,17f.) comprises jewels (*mani*), lapis lazuli (*veluriya*), mother-of-pearl (*saiṅkha*), stone (*silā*), coral (*pavāla*), silver (*rajata*), gold (*jātarūpa*), red-eye stones (*lohitāṅka*), and cats’ eye stones (*masāragalla*).

² In the Word Analysis to this rule, the limit for an unenclosed *ajjhārāma* is given with *upacāra* (Vin IV 163,26, BD III 80), whereas in the present case it is given with two stones’ throws.

484

Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation **(240)**

*In a dwelling place*¹ (*ajjhāvasathe*, Pāt 78,14) means: inside the enclosure of an enclosed [dwelling place], inside a pestle throw of one which is not enclosed.²

But this is the regulation in this context: e—It is [an offence entailing] expiation with forfeiture (*nissaggiya-pācittiya*) for one taking up or having taken up gold or silver for himself.³ [140] It is [an offence of] wrong doing [if it is] for the sake of the Saṅgha, a group, an individual, a *cetiya*, [or] renovations (*navakamma*).⁴ In respect of the other treasures, e.g. pearls, it is only [an offence of] wrong doing [if it is] for the sake of all.⁵ It is [an offence entailing] expiation for one storing up a lawful or unlawful object, even the property of [his] mother, under the heading of “treasurer” (*bhaṇḍāgārikasīsena*);⁶ but, having made such an object his own property, it is suitable to store [it] up. But if it is said, “Store this

e—e ≠ Sp IV 881,15–30

¹ *ajjhāvasatha* is explained as a house (*geha*) by the commentary (Kkh-nṭ 428,19), but in this case is further defined as a house established within a village (*antogāme nivīṭhageham adhippetam*), and distinguished from a house established within an *ārāma** which falls under *ajjhārāma* (Kkh-nṭ 428,20ff.). It is important to see that the rule is formulated in a general sense. In other words, it is referring to any *ārāma* or *ajjhāvasathā*, not only to a bhikkhu’s own *ārāma*, etc. As the commentary shows, there were others who thought that the *āvasatha* might lie within the *ārāma* or anywhere else, but that it does refer to a bhikkhu’s own dwelling place (“*āvasatho* ti ... attano *vasanatthānam vuccati ti keci*, Kkh-nṭ 428,22f.).

² Whereas here a pestle throw (*musala-pāta*) is mentioned, the Word Analysis gives the *upacāra* (Vin IV 163,27ff., BD III 80).

³ This is an offence according to Niss 18 M, see above, pp. 243ff.

⁴ Kkh to Niss 18 M the case of taking money for the sake of the Saṅgha and the *cetiya* are explicitly mentioned; the list then ends with “etc.” (Kkh 125,10). Whether this “etc.” only includes the *puggala* or renovations also is not clear and is not commented upon by the commentaries. These cases are not mentioned in the Vinaya. Furthermore, for Pāc 84 M, the Vinaya is missing a casuistry.

⁵ Mentioned in Kkh 125,11 to Niss 18 M.

⁶ In the commentary on Niss 18 M, Sp refers to the present rule for one who accepts anything as a treasurer (Sp III 690,19ff.: *sabbam pi nikkipanatthāya bhaṇḍāgārikasīsena sampaṭicchato upari ratanasikkhāpade āgatavasena pācittiyan*. “It is [an offence entailing] expiation for one accepting — under the heading of treasurer — everything for the sake of storing by virtue of [what is] handed down below in the rule about treasure (Pāc 84 M) below.”).

⟨241⟩

Suddhapācittiya 84 M

485

| up”, it is to be rejected, [saying,] “It is not suitable.” If being angry they
| throw it down and go away, it becomes an obstruction (*palibodha*)
| indeed; it is to be stored up. Carpenters, etc., doing work in the *vihāra*,
| ⟨241⟩ or overseers¹ say, “Having stored up whatever utensil or bed
| equipment there is, give it”; it is indeed not to be done because of desire
| or fear, but it is suitable to show the guarded place.^{–e}

| Even in respect of monasteries or dwelling places, in whatever place
| ^fthe fear arises “It will be taken by bhikkhus or novices”, in exactly
| such a place having taken it up or having had [it] taken up,^{–f} having
| made a notice [about it],² it is to be deposited, and it is to be announced,
| “Whoever’s goods have been lost, let him come.” Then whoever comes,
| he is to be asked, “What sort of goods of yours was lost?” If he agrees
| with the note, it is to be given [to him]. If not, he must be spoken to
| [with the words], “Search for it.”

| One going forth from the residence (*āvāsa**), may go forth, having
| deposited [it] in the hand of proper bhikkhus, [or], in their absence, in
| the hand of proper householders. But whoever neither goes forth, nor
| sees the owner, ^ghe should build a firm lodging or a *cetiya*, or a lotus
| pond with this [treasure]. If at the end of a long journey, the owner
| comes,^{–g} showing it to him he is to be addressed [with the words],
| “Rejoice”. If he does not rejoice, [but] rebukes “Give me money”, it is
| to be given, having made [him] take back [something different].³

^{f–f}Sp IV 882,1f. ^{g–g}≠ Sp IV 882,19ff.

¹ Literally, “king’s favourites” (*PED* s.v.).

² Looking at the description of how the bhikkhus should proceed if one comes
| and claims that it is his property, it is to be assumed that *saññāṇam karoti*
| consists in a description of the find circumstances.

³ Kkh-nṭ 429,13ff.: *samādapetvā ti* (Kkh 241,15) *aññam samādapetvā*, “uddissa
| *ariyā tīṭṭhanti, esā ariyāna[] yācanā*” *ti* (Jā III 354,18 = Mil 230,14) *vutta-*
nayena yācītvā ti attho. “*samādapetvā* means: having made [him] take [back]
| something different; the meaning is: having begged according to the method
| stated [thus], ‘Ariyans stand for [their alms]; this is the ariyans’ begging.’”
| Obviously the bhikkhu from whom the owner wants to get the money for the
| treasure simply stands silently there and in this manner begs him to take
| something different.

486 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨242⟩

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning a certain bhikkhu (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “taking up a treasure” (= 3. *subject matter*).

This, [i.e.] “unless [it is] in a monastery” or “in a dwelling”, is the twofold supplementary prescription (*anupaññatti*) here (i.e. in Pāc 84 M).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one having taken [it] up with disregard, not depositing it in an allowed place¹ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

There is no offence for one having grasped [it and] depositing [it] in an allowed place, for one taking up on trust, or for the time being a [thing] that may be touched, which is considered a treasure, for one taking [it] with the perception [that it is] a rag object from a dust heap, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the four constituent factors here: (i) acting [at an] unallowed [place], (ii) being the property of another, (iii) the absence of taking it on trust and of the perception [that it is] a rag object, (iv) taking up or having taken up (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] a go-between (Sgh 5 M).

The commentary on the rule about treasures is finished.

[3. The commentary on the rule about entering a village at the wrong time]

[85. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should enter a village at the wrong time without taking leave of a bhikkhu if one is present, unless [there are] some appropriate urgent matters, there is [an offence entailing] expiation.*

(Pāt 78,18–20 = Vin IV 166,11ff.)] ⟨242⟩

In the third [rule], *without taking leave of a bhikkhu if one is present* (*santam bhikkhum anāpucchā*, Pāt 78,18) means: this is exactly the method stated in the rule about visiting (Pāc 46 M).²

¹ That is, in the *ajjhārāma* or the *ajjhāvasatha* (Kkh-nṭ 429,16f.). This offence is not mentioned in the Vinaya since it does not contain a casuistry for this rule.

² This refers to the identical sequence in Pāc 46 M, explained in Kkh 198,23–26, see above, p. 394.

At the wrong time (*vikāle*, Pāt 78,18) means: from the passing away of midday up to dawn. Within this [time] interval not having taken leave, [thinking] either, “I [will] take leave for entering the village at the wrong time”, or “I shall enter the village”, without there being some appropriate urgent business, for one going beyond the enclosure of an enclosed village or entering the precinct of an unenclosed [village], [141] there is [an offence of] wrong doing in the first footstep, and [an offence entailing] expiation in the second footstep.

^hEven if many enter a village on account of some act, all of them must mutually take leave. Thinking, “In that village that act is not accomplished”, for them going to another village there is no renewed obligation to take leave. But if having given up their endeavour, going to [their] *vihāra*, on the way they become desirous of entering another village, leave must be taken indeed.

Having finished [his] meal¹ in a family house or in a sitting hall, one wishing to wander on begging for oil or begging for ghee, if there is a bhikkhu at his side he must take leave of [him], but if there is none, [thinking, “There] is none”, he may go. But going down the street, even seeing a bhikkhu, there is no obligation to take leave. Whatever road there is [leading through] the middle of a village, however, if for one going by that the thought arises, “I shall wander for oil, etc.”, [and if] he sees a bhikkhu at his side, leave must be taken of [him]. But for one wandering, not having departed from the road, there is no obligation to take leave.^h For one departing [from the road] there is [an offence entailing] expiation exactly in the stated manner.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. provenance) concerning the group of six (= 2. individuals) with respect to the subject matter “entering a village at the wrong time” (= 3. subject matter).

These, [i.e.] “if a bhikkhu is present” (*santam bhikkhum*, Pāt 78,18) and “without taking leave” (*anāpucchā*, Pāt 78,18) and “unless [there are] some appropriate urgent matters” (*aññatratrathārūpā accāyikā karaṇīyā*, Pāt 78,19) are the three supplementary prescriptions (*anupaññatti*) here (i.e. in Pāc 85 M).

[The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. prescription).

^{h-h}Sp IV 883,1-16

¹ Literally “done [his] meal routine” (*bhikkhūm kātavā*).

488

Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation

⟨243⟩

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] expiation.¹ It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one thinking it is the wrong time when it is the right time, and for one who is in doubt² (= 6. [sorts of] *offence*).

But there is no offence for him who thinks it is the right time, ⟨243⟩ and who either enters [a village] if there is some urgent business — whether having taken leave if [a bhikkhu] is there, or whether not having taken leave if there is none — or who goes to one or other of the monasteries inside [a settlement],³ [or] to bhikkhunīs' quarters,⁴ [or] to the sleeping houses of other sects, [or] to an assembly-hall;⁵ [there is no offence if] a road [leads through] a village, for one going by that, or in the case of disasters, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) not taking leave of a bhikkhu who is present, (ii) the absence of an allowed cause, (iii) entering a village at the wrong time (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., are exactly the same as for the *kathina* [rule] (Niss 1 M),

but [the offence against] this [rule originates in] activity and inactivity (= 11. *activity*).

The commentary on the rule about entering a village
at the wrong time is finished.

[4. The commentary on the rule about needle-cases]

[86. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should have a needle-case made of bone or ivory or horn, there is [an offence entailing] expiation with breaking up.*

(Pāt 78,22–23 = Vin IV 167,24ff.)]

ⁱ—In the fourth [rule]⁶ breaking up (*bhedana*) indeed is breaking up (*bhedanaka*). This (i.e. breaking up) belongs to it (i.e. to the offence entailing expiation), [that is, an offence entailing expiation] with breaking up (*bhedanakam*, Pāt 78,23).ⁱ Therefore, in respect of such a needle-

^{i–i}Sp IV 883,27f.

¹ Vin IV 166,23–26 (BD III 86).

² Vin IV 166,26f. (BD III 86).

³ *antarārāma*; see Kkh 199,15, above, p. 342, n. 1.

⁴ Bhikkhunīs' quarters always have to be within settlements.

⁵ *patikkamana*; see Kkh 199,16; above, p. 395, n. 7.

⁶ For this rule, see von Hinüber 1999: 65.

⟨243⟩

Suddhapācittiya 86 M

489

|case there is [an offence of] wrong doing in the making or having [it]
|made; but by receiving [an offence entailing] expiation is to be con-
|fessed, after having broken it up.

[This rule] was prescribed in the Sakka [country] (= 1. *provenance*)
|concerning many bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject
|matter “asking for many needle-cases”¹ (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and
|bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

There is a fourfold [offence entailing] expiation for one receiving it,
|having had what was unfinished by himself, finished by himself or by
|others, or even what was unfinished by others, [finished] by himself or
|by others.² It is [an offence of] wrong doing in the making and having
|made for the sake of another, [and] in using, having received what was
|made by another³ (= 6. [sorts of] *offence*).

There is no offence for one making from bone, etc., one or other
|among a block (*gaṇṭhikā*),⁴ a fire-starter (*araṇīka*), a buckle (*vidha*), an
|ointment box (*añjanī*), an ointment stick (*añjanisalāka*), the handle of
|an adze (? *vāsijāta*), a water-wiper (*udaka-puñchamī*);⁵ and for one who
|is insane⁶ (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the three constituent factors here: (i) there being a needle-
|case, (ii) it being made from bone, etc., (iii) receiving either making [it]
|for oneself or having had it made [for oneself] (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., are the same as for [the rule
|about] a go-between (Sgh 5 M).

The commentary on the rule about needle-cases is finished.

¹ In the rule itself nothing is said about asking for a needle-case, nor concerning the number of needle-cases. The subject matter as given here is based on the introductory story of this rule, where bhikkhus asked for many needle-cases made of ivory, etc. (Vin IV 167,2ff., BD III 87).

² Vin IV 167,32–68,1 (BD III 88).

³ Vin IV 168,2ff. (BD III 88).

⁴ See BD III 88, n. 4; see also above, p. 478, n. 4.

⁵ See above, p. 478, n. 6.

⁶ This list of items is already given in the non offence clause in the Vinaya (Vin IV 168,5ff., BD III 88/). Thānissaro (2007: I 506) hints at the fact that this list is simply illustrative, since many other items made from ivory, etc., are allowed for the bhikkhus.

490 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨244⟩

⟨244⟩ [5. The commentary on the rule about beds and seats]

[87. Pāc M: *When a bhikkhu is having a new bed or seat made, it is to be built with legs eight fingers high of the current finger, excluding the lower frame. For one exceeding that, there is [an offence entailing] expiation with cutting down.*

(Pāt 80,2–5 = Vin IV 168,24–27)]

[142] In the fifth [rule]¹ *bed (mañcam, Pāt 80,2)* means: one or other among bier-like beds (*masāraka*), etc.

A seat (pīṭham, Pāt 80,2), too, is just such like; but, like a bed, it is very long and, unlike a rectangular seat (*āsandika*), it does not have four equal sides.²

With cutting down (chedanakam, Pāt 80,4) means: just the same as “with breaking up”.³

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning Upananda (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “lying down on a high bed”⁴ (= 3. *subject matter*).

There is no offence for one making it according to the [proper] measurement, for one using it after having received it exceeding the [proper] measurement, having cut it down, or having thus dug it in so that only the [part having the proper] measurement appears above [the ground],⁵ or having made it lie upside down,¹ or having constructed a platform,² and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

¹ For this rule, see von Hinüber 1999: 64.

² Literally “it is not equilaterally four sided like the *āsandika*”. An *āsandika* is defined as a rectangular seat, see above, p. 474, n. 4.

³ With this the author refers back to Pāc 86, where the Pācittiya offence is qualified as a *bhedanaka Pācittiya*; see above, p. 488. Since there is a limit in the present rule as to the length of a bed or seat, a bed or seat that is too long is to be cut down.

⁴ This subject matter is deducible from the rule, since a maximal height of the feet of a bed or seat are given in it. The same measure, this time for the bedstead (*paṭipādaka*) is given in the Cullavagga (Vin II 150,7f.). For *paṭipādaka*, see also Coomaraswamy 1928: 265 s.v. *mañca*.

⁵ This case is not included in the non offence clause in the Vinaya (Vin IV 169,9ff., BD III 91). As the description in Sp IV 883,33ff. shows, this method is applied if the bhikkhu does not want to cut the bed’s legs down. *chinditvā paribhuñjatī ti* (Vin IV 169,10) *ettha sace na chinditukāmo hoti bhūmiyam*

These are the two constituent factors here: (i) there being a bed or a seat exceeding the [proper] measurement, (ii) receiving [it] by either making [it] for oneself or having had it made [for oneself] (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The remainder is all exactly the same as for the rule about needle cases (Pāc 86 M).

The commentary on the rule about beds and seats is finished.

[6. The commentary on the rule about covered with cotton]

[88. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should have a bed or a seat covered³ with cotton, there is [an offence entailing] expiation with tearing off.*

(Pāt 80,7–8 = Vin IV 169,29f.)]

In the sixth [rule],⁴ *covered with cotton* (*tūlonaddham*, Pāt 80,7) means: cotton is stretched over here (resolution of compound).⁵ [With this] it is said: Having spread an undermat (*cimilikā*),⁶ having thrown

j-j Sp IV 884,5f.

nikkhānitvā pamāṇam upari dasseti uttānam katvā paribhūñjati. “[If] he uses [it] having cut [it down] means: if here he is not desirous of cutting [it down], having dug [it] in the ground, having made visible, having made manifest, the [proper] measure above [the ground], he uses it.”

¹ Not included in the non offence clause in the Vinaya. Perhaps what is meant is that the bed is turned upside down so that the feet are in the air. None of the commentaries discusses this.

² Not included in the non offence clause in the Vinaya. Sp gives an explanation which serves as the basis for this statement. Sp IV 884,2f.: *ukkhipityā vā tulāsaṅghāte thapetvā aṭṭam katvā paribhūñjati sabbam vaṭṭati.* “Or having made a platform by lifting [the bed with the exceeding measure, and] putting it on the beams, he uses it. All that is suitable.” According to this, a type of loft bed is built. This corresponds well with the description of the beds and seats in a lofty hut which are placed above the beams, see Kh 163,4f. (Pāc 18 M), see above, p. 323, and n. 2.

³ The problem here is the fact that the covering is with cotton, for in another context a covered bed or seat are explicitly allowed (Vin II 150,31ff., BD V 211).

⁴ For this rule, see von Hinüber 1999: 64.

⁵ *tūlonaddham*; translated as a tatpuruṣa compound “covered with cotton” in the rule, is explained as a karmadhāraya compound “cotton that is stretched over” by the commentary.

⁶ *cimilikā*; as is obvious from Vin II 150,13f. a *cimilikā* in connection with a bed is made from a cloth or rag (*colaka*), and most probably served as a kind of

492 *Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation* ⟨245⟩

cotton on [top of] it, [the cotton] is stretched over the undermat.¹

*With tearing off (uddālanakam, Pāt 80,8) means: exactly the same as “with breaking up”.*¹

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “having made [it] covered with cotton” (= 3. *subject matter*).

There is no offence if it is for a binding (*āyoga*), for a girdle (*kāya-bandhana*), for a shoulder strap (*aṃsa-baddhaka*), for a bag for a bowl (*patta-tthavikā*), for a water strainer (*parissāvana*), for a pillow (*bimbo-hana*); for one using it having received it made by another, covered with cotton, [after] having torn off [the cotton], and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*). ⟨245⟩

And here a pillow is suitable only if it has the measurement of the head,² k—“the measurement of the head”, means: [a pillow] whose width is the distance of a span (*vidatthi**) [and] four fingers (*āṅgula**) between two of three corners;³ in the middle, a cubit [measured with the hand clenched in] a fist (*muṭṭhi-ratana**);⁴ in length, one and a half or two cubits (*ratana**).⁵ k

These are the two constituent factors here: (i) there being a bed or seat covered with cotton, (ii) receiving by either making [it] for oneself or having had it made [for oneself] (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The remainder is to be understood exactly in the stated manner.

The commentary on the rule about covered with cotton is finished.

k–k ≠ Sp VI 1217,24–28

undermat for a mattress. This is confirmed by the commentary. For further details, see Pāc 14 M, above, p. 312, n. 4.

¹ This is a reference to Pāc 86 M, where, fitting in with the context, *bhedanaka* is used where “tearing off” (*uddālanakam*) is used here. It is the same principle: the object is no longer prohibited once the appropriate action has been taken.

² See Vin II 150,21–24, where a pillow the size of the head is allowed, and larger ones are forbidden.

³ Thus the width altogether is sixteen *āṅgula**, that is about 28.8 cm (11.2 in.).

⁴ Since a *muṭṭhi-ratana** is measured with the hand clenched in a fist, so it should be shorter by several centimetres than a *ratana** (about 43.2 cm, 16.8 in.).

⁵ 64.8 cm (25.2 in.) or 86.4 cm (33.6 in.).

<245>

Suddhapācittiya 89 M

493

[7. The commentary on the rule about a sitting cloth]¹

[89. Pāc M: *When a bhikkhu is having a sitting [cloth] made, it is to be made according to the [prescribed] measurements. There these are the measurements: in length, two spans of the current² span, in width one and a half; the border, a span. For one exceeding that, there is [an offence entailing] expiation with cutting down.*

(Pāt 80,10–13 = Vin IV 171,11–14)]

In the seventh [rule]³ sitting [cloth] (*nisīdanam*, Pāt 80,10) means: [something] equal to a rug (or, to something that is milled); having spread [that]; having torn [it] at one end in two parts [as far as] the measure of a current span (*vidatthi**) (ca. 22 cm),⁴ this is the name for a requisite furnished with three border [pieces thus] made.

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “using sitting [cloths] which were not of the [proper] size” (= 3. *subject matter*).

This, [i.e.] “the border a span” (*dasā vidatthi*, Pāt 80,12) is the supplementary prescription (*anupaññatti*) here (i.e. in Pāc 89 M).

[The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

There is no offence for one making it the [proper] measure or smaller; for one using it having received it made by another exceeding the [proper] measure, having cut it; for one making it into something or other among canopies, etc.; and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *offence*).

These are the two constituent factors here: (i) the sitting [cloth] exceeding the [proper] measure, (ii) receiving by either making [it] for oneself or having it made [for oneself] (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The remainder is to be understood exactly in the stated manner.

The commentary on the rule about a sitting cloth is finished. [143]

¹ For the name of the rule (*nisīdana-sikkhāpada* or *nisīdana-santhata-sikkhāpada*), see Appendix 41.

² For an explanation of *sugata* in this meaning, see Schlingloff 1963: 544; Gräfe 1974: 127f.

³ *chedanake pācittiyam*; for a discussion of this, see von Hinüber 1999: 36, n. 79.

⁴ This is an accusative of the extension of space (see von Hinüber 1968: §69), and indicates how far the end of the cloth has to be torn into two pieces to create the three loose border pieces (*dasā*).

494

Bhikkhupātimokha: G. Rules Entailing Expiation

⟨246⟩

[8. The commentary on the rule about an itch-covering cloth]

[90. Pāc M: *When a bhikkhu is having an itch-covering cloth made, it is to be made according to the [prescribed] measurements. There, these are the measurements: in length, four spans of the current span; in width, two spans. For one exceeding that, there is [an offence entailing] expiation with cutting down.*

(Pāt 80,15–18 = Vin IV 172,11–14)]

In the eighth [rule] *itch-covering cloth* (*kanduppaṭicchādim*, Pāt 80,15) means: a robe allowed for covering an itchy boil or a running sore ⟨246⟩ or a thick scab disease ^a—from below the navel to above the circle of the knees.^a

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “wearing itch-covering cloths which were not of the [proper] size” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

The remainder is to be understood exactly in the manner stated in respect of a sitting [cloth] (Pāc 89 M).

The commentary on the rule about an itch-covering cloth is finished.

[9. The commentary on the rule about a rains cloth]

[91. Pāc M: *When a bhikkhu is having a rains cloth made, it is to be made according to the [prescribed] measurements. There, these are the measurements: in length six spans of the current span; in width, two and a half. For one exceeding that, there is [an offence entailing] expiation with cutting down.*

(Pāt 80,20–23 = Vin IV 172,30–33)]

Regarding the ninth [rule] it was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “wearing a rains cloth which is not of the [proper] size” (= 3. *subject matter*).

^a—^aSp IV 884,25

⟨246⟩*Suddhapācittiya 92 M*

495

The remainder which is to be said here, is exactly according to the method stated in [the rule about] a sitting [cloth] (Pāc 89 M).

The commentary on the rule about a rains cloth is finished.

[10. The commentary on the rule about Nanda]

[92. Pāc M: *If any bhikkhu should have a robe made to the measurements of a current robe or larger, there is [an offence entailing] expiation with cutting down.¹ There these are the measurements of the Sugata's current robe: in length nine spans of the current span, in width six spans. These are the measurements of the Sugata's current robe.*

(Pāt 82,2–6 = Vin IV 173,22–26)]

Regarding the tenth [rule], it was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the venerable Nanda (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “wearing a robe of the measurement of a current robe” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

The remainder is exactly of the method stated in respect of [the rule about] a sitting [cloth] (Pāc 89 M).

The commentary on the rule about Nanda is finished.

The section about treasures, the ninth.

[*Recited, venerable sirs, are the ninety-two rules entailing expiation.*

There I ask the venerable ones: “Are you pure in this?” A second time I ask: “Are you pure in this?” A third time I ask: “Are you pure in this?” The venerable ones are pure in this; therefore they are silent. Thus I record it.

Pāt 82,8–12 = Vin IV 174,8–12]

The commentary on the rules entailing solely expiation (that is, those requiring only expiation without forfeiture) of the Kañkhāvitaraṇī, the commentary on the Pātimokkha, is finished.

¹ It is to be assumed that the sentence up to here is the original rule because here, *sugata*, meaning “current”, is used in connection with the measurement regulation, and there is not yet a reference to a Sugata's robe. For details, see Appendix 42.

496 *Bhikkhupātimokha: H. Rules Entailing Confession* **〈247〉**

〈247〉 [H. The section of Rules Entailing Confession]

[These four rules, venerable sirs, entailing confession come up for recitation.]¹

[I. The commentary on the first rule entailing confession]

[I. Pāt M: *If any bhikkhu should chew or partake of solid food or soft food, having formally accepted it with his own hand from the hand of an unrelated bhikkhunī who has entered among the houses [i.e., is within a village], it is to be confessed by that bhikkhu [saying], “Friend, I have committed a censurable offence, unbecoming, entailing confession. That I confess.”*]

(Pāt 84.5–9 = Vin IV 176,8–13)]

In the first among [the rules entailing] confession, ^b—because of the phrase [of a bhikkhunī] *entered among the houses*^b (*antaragharam paviṭṭhāya*, Pāt 84.5f.), there is no fault if [the bhikkhu] — while himself standing in one or other of a carriage road (*rathiyā2 cul-de-sac (*vyūha*),³ junction (*siṅghāṭaka*)⁴ or house (*ghara*)⁵ — accepts [food] from the hand of an [unrelated bhikkhunī] who gives while standing in a [bhikkhus']*

^{b–b}Sp IV 886,15f.

¹ Normally such lines introducing a new group of rules in the Pātimokha are printed in square brackets in Kkh too. In the present case, this line from the Pātimokha (Pāt 46,2f.) was omitted.

² Kkh 247,9 reads *rathiyā* as a separate word; it has to be understood, however, as being part of the following compound *byūha-siṅghāṭaka-gharāṇam* (Kkh 247,10). *Rathiyā* is explained by *racchā* (Sp IV 886,8 = Kkh-nṭ 433,8), both words being Pāli forms derived from Skt *rathyā*.

³ *vyūha/byūha* is explained at Sp IV 886,8f. = Kkh-nṭ 433,9: ***byūhan ti*** (Vin IV 176,18 ≠ Kkh 247,10) *anibbjjhitvā thitā gatapaccāgataracchā*. “***Byūham*** means: a carriage road on which to go and to return; one that exists, not being a thoroughfare.”

⁴ Sp IV 886,9f. = Kkh-nṭ 433,9f.: ***siṅghāṭakan ti*** (Vin IV 176,18; Kkh 247,10): *caturkoṇam vā tikoṇam vā maggasamodhānaṭṭhānam*. “***Singhāṭakan*** means: a quadrangular or triangular place where ways come together.”

⁵ That is, places that count as *antaraghara*, i.e. village (Vin IV 176,18: *antaragharam nāma rathiyā byūham singhāṭakan gharāṇam*). The place where the bhikkhu stands is irrelevant for an offence against Pāt 1 M; see Sp IV 886,17f.: *bhikkhussa thitaṭṭhānam pana appamāṇam*. “But the place where the bhikkhu stands is irrelevant.”

|monastery inside [a settlement],¹ etc. But for him — while standing in
|carriage roads, etc., or in [bhikkhus'] monasteries inside [a settlement],
|etc. — accepting any sort of food for swallowing [from the hand of an
|unrelated bhikkhunī] who gives while standing in carriage roads, etc.,
|there is [an offence of] wrong doing in the formal accepting, [an offence
|entailing] confession with each swallow.

|The manner of it to be confessed by him is shown only in the rule in
|the way beginning with “Friend, [I have committed] a censurable
|[offence].”²

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning a
certain bhikkhu (= 2. *individual*) with respect to the subject matter “for-
mally accepting food from the hand of an unrelated bhikkhunī who had
entered among the houses” (= 3. *subject matter*).

[The rule] is a prescription exclusive [to bhikkhus] (= 4. *prescription*).

It is not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

And as this is, so are the remaining [rules entailing confession] too.³

There is a triple [offence entailing] confession.⁴ It is [an offence of]
wrong doing in the formal accepting [and] in the swallowing in respect

¹ *antarārāma* refers to a bhikkhu's monastery (*ārāma**) inside a settlement (Kkh 171,20, 199,15; see above, p. 342, n. 1). A nunnery is never called *ārāma*. A bhikkhus' monastery obviously does not count as a village, even if it is within a settlement, as the definition of *antaraghara* in the Vinaya shows, see above, p. 496, n. 5. Therefore there is no transgression of Pāṭ 1 M, if an unrelated bhikkhunī stands within such an *ārāma*. As the explanation of the commentary shows, in addition to the *ārāma*, there are other places where an unrelated bhikkhunī may stand and give food to a bhikkhu without this constituting an offence. Thus all these places do not count as “among the houses” (*antaraghara*). Kkh-nṭ 433,7f: *antarārāmādīśū ti* (Kkh 247,9) *antarārāmabhikkhu'nupassayatthiyaseyyāpaṭikkamanesu*. “In an *ārāma* inside [a settlement] means: in *ārāmas* inside [of settlements], in bhikkhunīs' quarters, in sleeping places of members of other sects, or in assembly halls.”

² Pāṭ 84,8 = Vin IV 176,11.

³ This means that the remaining Pāṭidesanīyas also are exclusive to bhikkhus (4. *prescription*) and not connected with commanding someone else (5. *command*). Accordingly, these two classification categories are not mentioned in the other three Pāṭidesanīyas.

⁴ Vin IV 176,25–28 (BD III 105).

498 *Bhikkhupātimokha: H. Rules Entailing Confession* ⟨247⟩

of [edibles allowed] during a watch of the night (*yāma-kālika*), etc.¹ Similarly, [it is the same] in respect of [food that is allowed during the time period] up to the [right] time (*yāva-kālika*) from one ordained by one side only.² Even for those who think she is not a relative when she is a relative or who are in doubt about it, exactly this is the method.³ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

But there is no offence for one who thinks she is a relative [when she is a relative]; or if an [unrelated bhikkhuni] induces a female relative to give;⁴ or if she gives, having deposited [it];⁵ and [there is no offence] for one [if] whatever [bhikkhuni] — when there is a reason — gives [edibles allowed] during a watch of the night (*yāma-kālika*), etc.,⁶ having taken [them] out [to a place] outside the village, [saying,] “Eat”, [I44] while standing in a monastery inside a [settlement]⁷ [or] in a bhikkhuni’s quarters [or] in the sleeping places of other sects [or] in an assembly-hall;⁸ and [there is no offence] for one eating, having taken [it] from the hand of trainees and female novices, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. non-offence).

¹ Vin IV 176,29ff. (BD III 105). “Etc.” takes up two further types of edibles, namely “[edibles restricted to] seven days” (*sattāha-kālika*) and “[edibles allowed] for the remainder of [one’s] life” (*yāva-jīvika*).

² Vin IV 176,31ff. (BD III 105). That means if the bhikkhuni is not yet a fully fledged bhikkhuni because she has been ordained solely by the Bhikkhuni Saṅgha but not yet by the Bhikkhu Saṅgha.

³ Vin IV 176,33ff. (BD III 105f.).

⁴ Compare Vin IV 176,36 (BD III 106): *anāpatti ... dāpeti na deti*. “There is no offence if [she] induces [another] to give, [but] does not [herself] give.” Kkh-nṭ 433,16f.: *ñātikāya vā dāpentyā ti* (Kkh 247,22) *sayam adatvā yāyā kāyaci ñātikāya dāpentyā, aññātikāyā ti attho*. “Or if she induces a female relative to give means: not having given herself she induces whatever female relative to give; the meaning is: if a non-relative.”

⁵ As is shown by Sp IV 886,27ff. what is meant is that the bhikkhuni who is not related puts what she wants to give on the ground (*bhūmiyam thapetvā*). In this way, one element mentioned in the rule — namely, to receive something from the bhikkhuni’s hand — is not fulfilled.

⁶ Again, the two other types of food subsumed under “etc.” are *sattāha-kālika* and *yāva-jīvika*.

⁷ *antarārāma*; see above, p. 342, n. 1.

⁸ *patikkamana*; see above, p. 395, n. 7.

These are the five constituent factors here: (i) being fully ordained, (ii) not being a relative, (iii) formally accepting [it] with one's own hand from the hand of [an unrelated bhikkhunī] standing among the houses, (iv) [being food that is allowed during the time period] up to the [right] time (*yāva-kālika-tā*), (v) swallowing (= 9. constituent factors). ⟨248⟩

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] origin), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] sheep's wool (Niss 16 M).

The commentary on the first rule entailing confession is finished.

[2. The commentary on the second rule entailing confession]

[2. Pāṭ M: *[If] bhikkhus, being invited, are eating among families, [and] if a bhikkhunī is standing there giving directions, [saying], “Give curry here, give rice there”, that bhikkhunī is to be sent away by those bhikkhus, [saying,] “Sister, go away for as long as the bhikkhus are eating.” If it should not occur to even one bhikkhu to send that bhikkhunī away, [saying,] “Sister, go away while the bhikkhus are eating”, it is to be confessed by those bhikkhus, [saying,] “Friend, we have committed a censurable offence, unbecoming, to be confessed. That we confess.”*

(Pāṭ 84,11–18 = Vin IV 177,20–27)]

In the second [rule give] curry here (*idha sūpam*, Pāṭ 84,12), etc., means: showing a manner of directing

^c—Sister, go away for as long (*apasakka tāva bhagini*, Pāṭ 84,14), etc., means: showing the manner for [her] to be sent away.—^c

There, this is the regulation: if [the bhikkhunī] has not been sent away by even one bhikkhu, [there is an offence of] wrong doing in formally accepting for those taking food for the sake of swallowing [it]. There is [an offence entailing] confession with each swallow.²

^c—^cSp IV 887,8f.

¹ *sā bhikkhunī*; Nāṇatūsita 2014: 285, says that the *sā* should be omitted.

² In Kkh 248,16 this passage ends with a *ti*. The same holds true for the equivalent phrase in the third and fourth Pāṭidesanīya rules (Kkh 249,16; 251,2). The *ti* does not exist in the Sinhalese edition (Kkh 248, n. 7; 249, n. 9; 251, n. 1).

Since the reading in the Vinaya slightly deviates (*āpatti pāṭidesanīyassa*, Vin IV 178,8f, etc.) it is highly likely that the *ti* does not indicate a quotation.

It was probably inserted to indicate the end of the word commentary in Kkh.

500 *Bhikkhupātimokha: H. Rules Entailing Confession* ⟨249⟩

[This rule] was prescribed at Rājagaha (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “not restraining a bhikkhunī who was directing” (= 3. *subject matter*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] confession.¹ If one ordained by one side is directing, it is [an offence of] wrong doing for one not restraining [her];² similarly, for one thinking she was ordained when she was not ordained, and for one who is in doubt.³ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

But there is no offence for one thinking she is not ordained [when she is not ordained]; and for him who, having formally accepted, eats when she induces [someone] to give her own food, or when she gives food to others, or induces [someone] to give what is not given, or [induces someone to give] there where it was not given, or induces [someone] to give the same to everyone, or if a trainee or a female novice is directing; except for the five [kinds of] foods (*bhojana*) [there is no offence] anywhere; and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the five constituent factors here: (i) being fully ordained, (ii) there being [any of the] five kinds of food, (iii) directing otherwise than in the allowed manner among the houses, (iv) non-restraint, (v) swallowing (= 9. *constituent factors*). ⟨249⟩

The origin (= 10. [sorts of] *origin*), etc., are the same as for the *kaṭhina* rule (Niss 1 M).

The commentary on the second rule entailing confession is finished.

[3. The commentary on the third rule entailing confession]

[3. Pāt M: *Whichever families are agreed upon as undergoing training, if any bhikkhu — not previously invited, not ill, having accepted with his own hand solid food or soft food among such families agreed upon as undergoing training — should chew or partake of them, it is to be confessed by that bhikkhu [saying,] “Friend, I have committed a censurable offence, unbecoming, to be confessed. That I confess.”*

(Pāt 84,21–86,2 = Vin IV 180,22–27)]

Since this, however, is not indicated in the other rules or in the first Pāṭidesanīya (Kkh 247,13), it is likely that the *ti* did not originally belong to the text.

¹ Vin IV 178,10–13 (BD IV 108).

² Vin IV 178,13f. (BD IV 108).

³ Vin IV 178,14f. (BD IV 108).

In the third [rule] *agreed upon as undergoing training* (*sekha-sammatāni*, Pāṭ 84,21) means: agreed upon as having obtained training.¹

[Any bhikkhu] *not previously invited* (*pubbe animantito*, Pāṭ 84,22f.) means: [any bhikkhu not invited] prior to entering² the precinct of the house, while not yet entering the precinct, is not previously invited.³

[Any bhikkhu who is] *not ill* (*agilāno*, Pāṭ 84,23) means: one who is able to wander for alms.

To be confessed (*pāṭidesanīyam*, Pāṭ 86,2) means: there is [an offence of] wrong doing first in formally accepting for one who takes food after having entered the precinct of a house; having taken it, there is [an offence entailing] confession with each swallow for one eating [it] somewhere or other.⁴

[This rule] was prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning many bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “formally accepting not knowing the limit”⁵ (= 3. *subject matter*).

¹ Such families obtain a local Saṅgha’s agreement (*sammuti*) to be considered in training via a *ñatti-dutiya-kamma**. Vin IV 179,2ff.: *anujānāmi ... evarūpassa kulassa ñattidutiyena kammena sekhasammutim dātum*. “I allow ... to give to such a family the allowance of being in training through a procedure [with a decision as] the second [element] after [putting] the motion.” The formula (*kamma-vācā**) for this procedure is given subsequently (Vin IV 179,5–13, BD III 110f.).

² *okkamati*; see above, p. 342, n. 7.

³ An invitation which a bhikkhu obtains from such a family when he has already entered the precinct of that family’s house does not count as an invitation since that invitation might have been made because the family felt obliged to invite that bhikkhu as he was already that close to their house. Vin IV 180,36: *gharūpacāram okkamante nimanteti, eso animantito nāma*. “If [that family] invites [the bhikkhu] when he is entering the precinct of [their] house, the [bhikkhu] is not invited indeed.”

⁴ This phrase ends with *ti* in Kkh 249,16 (omitted in the Sinhalese and some old editions). Here, the same is valid as stated in connection with the second Pāṭidesanīya rule; see above, pp. 499f., n. 2.

⁵ *na mattam jānitvā*; the same expression appears in Pāc 34 (Kkh 179,5), Pāc 57 (Kkh 207,22). In the present case it seems to refer to the limits not to be transgressed by a bhikkhu in order to be counted as invited.

502 *Bhikkhupātimokha: H. Rules Entailing Confession* ⟨249⟩

But these [statements, “he is] not previously invited” (*pubbe animantito*, Pāt 84.22f.), [and “he is] not ill” (*agilāmo*, Pāt 84.23) are the two supplementary prescriptions here (= 4. *prescription*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] confession.¹ In respect of [edibles allowed] during a watch of the night, etc.,² there is [an offence of] wrong doing in formally accepting as well as in swallowing.³ Similarly, for one thinking they are agreed upon as undergoing training when they are not agreed upon as undergoing training, and for one who is in doubt⁴ (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

But there is no offence for one who thinks they are not agreed upon as undergoing training [when they are not agreed upon as undergoing training];⁵ and [there is no offence for him] who has been previously invited or is ill or takes food prepared in their house for another one; and [there is no offence] for him in eating [the food which] the [donors] give, having taken it out of [their] house for someone,⁶ either having taken [it] out as the very first without having seen the bhikkhu [for whom it is intended] in the sitting hall, etc., or having placed it at the foot of the door (i.e. the threshold);⁷ [there is no offence] in the case of

¹ Vin IV 181,12–16 (BD III 113).

² The “etc.” includes “[food restricted to] seven days” (*sattāha-kālika*), and “[food allowed] for [one’s] lifetime” (*yāva-jīvika*), see Vin III 181,16.

³ Vin IV 181,16ff. (BD III 113f.).

⁴ Vin IV 181,18f. (BD III 114).

⁵ Vin IV 181,20 (BD III 114).

⁶ Explained as “giving it by bringing it to the *āsana-sāla* or *vihāra*” (Sp IV 887,21f.: *gharato nīharitvā denti ti* (Vin IV 181,23) *āsanasālam vā vihāram vā ānetvā denti*).

⁷ As the following citation from Sp shows, for an uninvited bhikkhu who eats food which a family that is agreed upon as undergoing training intends to give to some invited bhikkhu, it is crucial when eating this food that the donors bring out the food without the recipient having been seen prior to that. Sp IV 887,22–26: *sace pi anāgate bhikkhumhi paṭhamam yeva nīharitvā dvāre thapetvā pacchā sampattassa denti, vattati. bhikkhum pana disvā antogehato nīharitvā diyyamānam na vattatī ti Mahāpaccariyam vuttam.* “Even if — when the bhikkhu does not come — [the donors], having taken, as the very first, [food] out [of their house], having deposited it at the door, give it to the one that arrived later, it is suitable. But [the food] being given after having seen the bhikkhu,

⟨250⟩*Pātidesanīya 4 M*

503

permanent food (*nicca-bhattika*), of ticket food (*salāka-bhatta*), [145] of [food given on one day of a] half month (*pakkhika*), of [food given on] an observance day (*uposathika*), of [food given on] the first day of a half month (*pātipadika*); [there is no offence] for one eating [edibles allowed] during a watch of the night, etc.,¹ given with the words, “Eat when there is a reason”,² and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*). ⟨250⟩

These are the five constituent factors here: (i) being agreed upon as undergoing training, (ii) not being previously invited, (iii) not being ill, (iv) entering the precinct of the house, (v) eating, having taken any food other than permanent food, etc. (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. *[sorts of] origin*), etc., are the same as for [the rule about] sheep’s wool (Niss 16 M).

The commentary on the third rule entailing confession is finished.

[4. The commentary on the fourth rule entailing confession]

[4. Pāt M: *Whichever wilderness lodgings are considered dangerous, are frightening, if any bhikkhu — [living] in such lodgings, having formally accepted with his own hand in a monastery solid food or soft food not announced beforehand, not being ill — should chew or partake of them, it is to be confessed by that bhikkhu [saying], “Friend, I have committed a censurable offence, unbecoming, to be confessed. That I confess.”*

(Pāt 86,5–16 = Vin IV 184,20–24)]

and having taken it out [of the house, that] is not suitable’, [thus] it is said in the Mahāpaccarī.”

¹ For a similar sentence in the Vinaya, see Vin IV 85,5f. [Pāc 36]: *yāmakālikam sattāhakālikam yāvajīvikam “sati paccaye paribhūjā” ti deti.*

² Vin IV 184,16f.: *yāmakālikam ... sati paccaye paribhūjati*, with Oldenberg’s note, “I propose to read *paribhūjā ‘ti deti’*” (Vin IV 363). This in fact is the reading of Vin B^e S^e. Oldenberg’s note seems to have escaped IBH’s notice who translates “if, when there is a reason, he gives, ... and he makes use of it” (BD III 114) as if the giving and using was done by the same person. The reading *paribhūjati deti* instead of *paribhūjā ti deti* (so for example Vin IV 85,6, 177,2) was probably inspired by other non-offence clauses without *deti*, where in fact we should read *paribhūjati* (Vin IV 83,18, 86,14, 87,21, etc.).

504 *Bhikkhupātimokha: H. Rules Entailing Confession* ⟨250⟩

In the fourth [rule the phrase] *Whichever wilderness [lodgings]* (*yāni kho pana tāni āraññakāni*, Pāt 86,5), etc., is to be understood exactly according to the manner stated in the rule about dwelling away from robes (*cīvara-vippavāsa-sikkhāpada*,¹ Niss 29 M).

Not announced beforehand (*pubbe appaṭisañviditam*, Pāt 86,7): here, whatever is announced by a woman or man or householder (*gahaṭṭha*) or one gone forth (*pabbajita*)² after having entered a monastery or the precinct of a monastery [saying], “Solid or soft food will be brought, sirs, by such-and-such a family”, that [food] should be brought afterwards, exactly as announced;³ or, having made ingredient[s] for the [announced] or something other, even something abundant (?), together with it (i.e. the announced),⁴ [or] ^d—having heard that such-and-such a family, having had [food] announced, having taken solid or soft food, goes (i.e. to bring the food), [but then] other^d families⁵ together with this [family]⁶ should bring it¹ — all that is called “announced”.² But

^{d-d} ≠ Sp IV 888,13f.

¹ Niss 29 M is listed under the name *sāsaṅka-sikkhāpada* in the Pātimokha as well as in the present edition of Kkh. The present cross-reference shows that an earlier name was *cīvara-vippavāsa-sikkhāpada*. Another name for this rule seems to have been *āraññaka-sikkhāpada* (Kkh-pt 71,24) in a quotation from Vajirabuddhi’s Anuganṭhipada (characterized by *likhitam*), and elsewhere. This name is used in Sp II 301,13 alternatively to the name *sāsaṅka-sikkhāpada* (Sp III 730,1), and in Kkh-pt 71,24.

² This is a common enumeration, see for instance A III 71,29f., 33–72,1, 5f., etc. (NDB 686).

³ This corresponds to the announcement mentioned in Vin IV 183,17–20 (BD II 117). In that case, the announcement corresponds exactly to what happens afterwards.

⁴ Here, the food deviates from what was announced insofar as the food already made is not brought but the ingredients for it are. This takes up Vin IV 183,23ff., concerning which see the following example: *yāguyā patisamvidite tassā parivāro āhariyyati, etam patisamviditam nāma*. “If [the food] is announced by way of rice gruel, [but then] the ingredient[s] for this [rice gruel] are brought, this is called announced.”

⁵ That is, families not announced; see Pāc-y 130,15: *aññāni pī ti* (Sp IV 888,14) *patisamviditakulato aññāni pi kulāni*. “Even other [families] means: even families other than the announced family.”

⁶ Kkh 250,21 reads *tehi* with the variant *tena* in the Sinhalese edition (n. 15). Since in Kkh 250,20 a specific family has been named (*itthannāmāṇi kulam*), the reading *tena* here is the only reasonable reading. This is also supported by

⟨251⟩*Pāṭidesanīya 4 M*

505

[what is not announced and not brought in this manner, that is called *not announced* (*appaṭisamviditam*, Pāt 86,7).

Not ill (*agilāno*, Pāt 86,8) means: he who is able to go for alms.

To be confessed (*pāṭidesanīyam*, Pāt 86,10f.) means: there is [an offence of] wrong doing in the formal accepting for one swallowing, having formally accepted in a monastery or in the precinct of a monastery even [something] of such a sort given by travellers going through the middle of the monastery. ⟨251⟩ There is [an offence entailing] confession with each swallow.

[This rule] was prescribed in the Sakka [country] (= 1. *provenance*) concerning many bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “not announcing when thieves are dwelling in a monastery” (= 3. *subject matter*).

This, “not ill” (*agilāno*, Pāt 86,8) is one supplementary prescription here (= 4. *prescription*).

There is a triple [offence entailing] confession.³ In respect of [edibles allowed] during a watch of the night, etc.,⁴ there is only [an offence of] wrong doing in formally accepting for the sake of nutriment, as well as in swallowing. Similarly, for one who thinks it is not announced when it is announced and for one who is in doubt (= 6. [sorts of] offence).

the reading of Kkh-nt 434.25, quoting *tena saddhiṃ āharantū*, and by Pāc-y 130,15f.: *tenā ti* (Sp IV 888,14) *pāṭisamviditakulena*. “With this means: with the announced family.”

¹ The crucial factor here is that there are families who bring the food instead of or in addition to the family that was announced as bringing it. A food counts as announced if it was announced earlier that a specific family would bring the food, but then it is brought by them together with others. Sp IV 888,13ff.: *asukam nāma kulam pāṭisamviditam katvā khādanīyādīni gahetvā gacchatī ti sutvā aññāni pi tena saddhiṃ attano deyyadhammam āharanti, vatṭati*. “If [a bhikkhu] has heard that such-and-such a family, having made an announcement, having taken hard food, etc., goes (that is, to bring the food), [the food] is suitable (that is, counts as announced), even if other [families] bring [their] own gift[s] together with this [family].”

² Kkh 250,23 starts a new paragraph here, but this belongs to the preceding section.

³ Vin IV 184.4–8 (BD II 118).

⁴ The “etc.” includes *sattāha-kālikā*, and *yāva-jīvika* food (see above, p. 502, n. 2).

506 *Bhikkhupātimokha: H. Rules Entailing Confession* ⟨251⟩

But there is no offence for one who thinks it is announced [when it is announced]; for one who is ill; and for one who eats [something] brought that has been announced [beforehand], or the remainder [of the food] of one who is ill, or [what] has been formally accepted outside a monastery, or roots and fruit, etc., just growing there or — in respect of [edibles allowed] during a watch of the night, etc.¹ — whatever has been obtained [with the words,] “Eat when there is a reason”, and for one who is insane, etc. (= 7. *non-offence*).

These are the seven constituent factors here: (i) there are wilderness lodgings as stated, (ii) [food that is allowed during the time period] up to the [right] time not growing there, (iii) not being ill, (iv) not being the remainder [of the food] of one who is ill, (v) not being announced, (vi) formal acceptance inside a monastery, (vii) swallowing (= 9. *constituent factors*).

The origin (= 10. [*sorts of*] *origin*), etc., are exactly the same as for the *kathina* [rule] (Niss 1 M);

but [the offence against] this [rule originates in] activity and inactivity (= 11. *activity*).

The commentary on the fourth rule entailing confession is finished.

The commentary on [the rules] entailing confession of the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*, the commentary on the *Pātimokha*, is finished.

[Recited, venerable sirs, are the four rules entailing confession.

There I ask the venerable ones: “Are you pure in this?” A second time I ask: “Are you pure in this?” A third time I ask: “Are you pure in this?” The venerable ones are pure in this, therefore they are silent. Thus I record it.

Pāt 86,12–16 = Vin IV 184,20–24]²

¹ See above, p. 503, n. 1.

² Similar to the end of the *Nissaggiya-Pācittiya* (Kkh 142,12), and the *Pācittiya* sections (Kkh 246,26) here in the case of the *Pāṭidesanīya* section too the concluding sentences transmitted in the *Pātimokha* at the end of each offence section are not printed in the Kkh edition, probably because they are not commented upon. This is different in the concluding sections of the *Pārājika* (Pāt 10,9–17; Kkh 55,15–22), *Saṅghādisesa* (Pāt 22,1–15; Kkh 82,3–15), and *Aniyata* rules (Pāt 26,1–6; Kkh 91,22–26), where the respective passages from

Page 555 job: 1272818

⟨252⟩ *Sekhiya I M* 507

⟨252⟩ [I. The Section of Rules of Training]¹

[I. The commentary on the twenty-six rules on proper behaviour]²

[I. The commentary on the rule about even all round]

[I. Sekh:³ *I shall wear [the inner garment]⁴ even all round; this is a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 88,6 = Vin IV 185,18)]

In the first among the rules of training e—*all round* (*parimandalam*, Pāt 88,6) means: a circle (*maṇḍalam*) all around (*samantato*).⁵

A training to be practised (*sikkhā karaniyā*, Pāt 88,6) means: “Thus I shall wear [the inner garment]” is a training to be practised (*sikkhā kātabbā*) everywhere, in a monastery as well as inside a house [**146**]. And in this connection (i.e. in the context of the Sekhiya rules) since even the practices stated in the Vatta-kkhandhaka⁵ are rules of training (*sekhiyāni*) on account of the fact that they are to be trained, therefore an exact determination [of the Sekhiya rules as to numbers] as in the case of the [rules entailing] defeat, etc.,⁶ is not made. And in order to

e—eSp IV 889,5

the Pātimokkha have been added by the editors of Kkh, because there these sections are commented upon by the Kkh author. In order to present a consistent text, we also add the translation of these concluding passages in those cases where they are not commented upon.

¹ For the arrangement of the Sekhiya rules, see above, pp. xxxvff.

² The Pāli version of this heading (*chabbisati sāruppasikkhāpadavāṇīnā*, see Kkh 259,10) is to be inserted within square brackets in the Kkh edition after line Kkh 252,1 in analogy to how it is done in the other sections.

³ Since the Sekhiyas are identical for bhikkhus (monks) and bhikkhunīs (nuns), unlike in the other offence groups, we do not differentiate between M (monks) and N (nuns).

⁴ The verb *nivāseti* is related to the garment called *nivāsana* (inner garment) which again is another word for the lower robe (*antara-vāsaka*).

⁵ Cullavagga chapter 8, Vin II 207–35.

⁶ Following the commentary, this refers to the fact that, unlike the other sections of the Pātimokkha (Pār Pāt 8,2; Sgh Pāt 12,2f.; Aniy Pāt 24,2f.; Niss Pāt 28,2f.; Pāc Pāt 46,2f.; Pāt Pāt 84,2f.), in the case of the Sekhiyas (Pāt 88,2f.) there is no exact determination of the number of rules that come up for recitation (Kkh-nṭ 435,8–14). Von Hinüber 1995a: 15 [2009: I: 106], n. 23, states that “this points to the fact that their number was not as strictly fixed as that of all the other offenses.”

508

Bhikkhupātimokha: I. Rules of Training

(252)

show the discipline and the practice without stating [the offence] with the name of the offence thus, “If any bhikkhu should wear [the inner garment] letting [it] hang down, there is [an offence of] wrong doing”,¹ the text is set up thus in all the rules, “This is a training to be practised.” But because [of it] being stated in the Word Analysis that there is f-[an offence of] wrong doing,^{-f} in acting disrespectfully [an offence of] wrong doing is to be understood everywhere.

Now, *all round* (*parimāṇḍalam*, Pāt 88,6),² means: here, having covered the circle of the navel, g-starting from the bone of the calves below the circle of the knees, having lowered the inner garment (*nivāsanam*) a measure of eight fingers (*angula**)^{-g} it is worn even all round by the one wearing it.

It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one not having worn it thus, wearing it out of disrespect, by letting it hang down either in front or behind. Not only for that, h-but also whatever faults of wearing [garments] are stated in the Khandhaka [with the words], i-“At that time the group of six wore a householders’ garments; they wore [a garment with] an elephant’s trunk, a fish’s tail, a four-corner arrangement, a palmyra fan [shape], with a hundred folds”,⁻ⁱ even for one wearing [the inner garment] in this manner, there is indeed [an offence of] wrong doing.^{-h}

There, j-“[a garment with] an elephant’s trunk”³ (*hatthisonḍakam*, Kkh 252,18f.) means: [a garment] worn making [it] hanging down from the base of the navel in the shape of an elephant’s trunk, like the inner garment of the Colīka women.⁴

f-f Vin IV 185,21 g-g Sp IV 889,7f. h-h ≠ Sp IV 889,20-24 i-i Vin II 137,5-16
j-j ≠ Sp VI 1212,4-23

¹ The wording in the Suttavibhaṅga (*yo anādariyam paticca ... olambento nivāseti, āpatti dukkataṭassa*, Vin IV 185,20f.) is transformed into a *yo pana bhikkhu* formulation.

² Kkh 252,13 *parimāṇḍalan* should be put into italics.

³ Kkh 252,22 *hatthi-soṇḍakam* in italics should be in roman type.

⁴ *hatthi-soṇḍa-saṇṭhāna*; Dieter Schlingloff (email 29/10/2017) referred me to a mural in the Devil’s Cave in Qizil (cave 199) telling the story of the Kinnarī. In the lower middle part of the mural one sees women in the water who wear their lower garment having made an appendage hanging down from the navel in the form of an elephant’s trunk. Whether the fashion on the mural actually corresponds to the *hatthi-sondaka* mode of our text remains unclear. For an

⟨253⟩*Sekhiya I M*

509

⟨253⟩ “[A garment with] a fish’s tail” (*macchavālakam*, Kkh 252,19) means: [a garment] worn having the edge of the border (*dasanta*) hang down on one side, the edge of the fringe (*pāsanta*)¹ on the other.

“[A garment with] a four-corner arrangement” (*catukkannakam*, Kkh 252,19) means: [a garment] worn showing four corners thus: two corners above, [and] two corners below.²

“[A garment with] a palmyra fan [shape] (*tālavantakam*, Kkh 252,19) means: [a garment] worn having the robe hang down in the shape of a palmyra fan.

“[A garment] with a hundred folds”³ (*satavalikam*, Kkh 252,19) means: [a garment] worn by one making a belt (*ovaṭṭikam*) having folded a long cloth (*sātaka*) over many times, or [a garment] worn having shown folds on the right and left sides without intervals. But if starting from the knee one or two folds are perceived, it is suitable.

“A loin-cloth” (*samvelliyan*, ≠ Kkh 252,20)⁴ means: [a garment] worn tucking the end of the lower garment (*kacchā*) [into the waistband] as though [being worn] by wrestlers, workmen, etc.

It is not suitable to wear [an inner garment] thus, neither for one who is ill nor for one setting out on a road. When they, while going on a road,

illustration, see von Le Coq 1974: plate 9c. Monika Zin (email 08/01/2018) is highly critical vis-a-vis this interpretation, and neither aware of the term nor of this manner of wearing clothes in India.

¹ *pāsanta* “end of the loop or snare” is used as an explanation for *pavananta*, which seems to be something at the end of a girdle with which to fix the latter. *pāsanta* is equated with *dasā-mūla* (Kkh-nt 436,22; Sp-t III 391,4), and *dasā-pariyosāna* (VmV II 236,2). Thus it seems that the two words — *dasanta* and *pāsanta* — are here both used for the border of the robe.

² What is meant by this remains unclear.

³ Vin II 137,7 reads °*vallikam*; *vallikā* means “an ornament of the ear” or “a jungle rope” (PED s.v.). IBH accordingly translates this as “the hundred jungle ropes” (BD V 191 with note 4). In the *uddāna* at the end of the chapter this is taken up as *sata-vali* (Vin II 144,35). In Ja I 499,22, a poor man had a pair of coarse cloths that he had washed and wrung out, which resulted in them having a hundred or a thousand creases. This makes plain that what is meant here are “folds” or “creases” (*valika*), and not jungle ropes (*vallikā*).

⁴ Kkh 252,20 *samvelliyan*.

are throwing up one or two corners [of the inner garment, and] sticking [them] fast above the lower robe (*antara-vāsaka*),¹ or wearing one yellowish-red cloth (*kāsāva*) in this manner inside, [and] outside they wear another, all that is not suitable.

But an ill [bhikkhu] having shown the belt of his inner yellowish-red cloth (*antokāsāva*)² is allowed to wear another above.³ By a [bhikkhu] who is not ill [and] who wears two [inner garments] they may be worn having put them together (i.e. having made them into one).^{4-j} Thus k-avoiding all this,^k [which is] rejected in the Khandhaka, and the hanging down [dealt with in the Sekhiya rule,⁵ an inner garment] k-is to be worn possessed of the stated characteristics, without change, even all round.^k For one not having worn [it] thus, a-making any change

^{k-k} ≠ Sp VI 1212,24f. ^{a-a} ≠ Sp VI 1212,25f.

¹ *Nivāsana* and *antara-vāsaka* are different words for the same robe.

² Kkh 253,16 *anto kāsāvassa* should be corrected to *antokāsāvassa*.

³ Thus altogether he wears only two robes, which is allowed for ill bhikkhus (Vin III 199,3ff.).

⁴ *sagunam katvā*; the point seems to be that bhikkhu who is ill wears the *antokāsāva* like an *antara-vāsaka*, that is, covering the lower part of his body, and the other *kāsāva* either over it or like an *uttarāsaṅga*, or a *saṅghāṭī*, thus covering the upper part of his body, including the belt of the *anto-kāsāva*. The healthy bhikkhu can put two cloths together, receiving a double cloth. Such a doubling of the fabric is known from the outer robe (*saṅghāṭī*). See the commentary to the *saṅghāṭīs* to be given to a preceptor by his pupil when he wants to go into the village. Sp V 978,18-21: *sagunam katvā ti* (Vin I 46,14) *dve cīvarāni ekato katvā, tā ekato katā dve pi saṅghāṭīyo dātabbā. sabbam pi hi cīvaram saṅghāṭitattā saṅghāṭī ti vuccati. tena vuttam saṅghāṭīyo dātabbā ti* (Vin I 46,14). “**Having put them together** means: having made two robes into one; they having been made into one, even two should be given as outer robes (*saṅghāṭī*). For, the entire robe is called *saṅghāṭī*, on account of its being pegged together (*saṅgahitattā*). Therefore it is said [in the Vinaya]: *Sāṅghāṭīs* (plural) **should be given to him.**” See also BD IV 60, n. 3.

⁵ *olambaka*; this refers to what is dealt with in this Sekhiya rule, as can be seen from the parallel in Sp VI 1212,23ff.: *iti yañ ca idha paṭikkittam yañ ca Sekhiyavāṇṇanāyam tam sabbam vajjetvā nibbikāram timaṇḍalam paṭicchādentena parimandaṇam nivāsetabbam*. “Thus what is rejected here (that is, in the Cullavagga) as well as in the commentary to the Sekhiya [section], avoiding all this, [a garment] is to be worn even all round, without change, covering the three circles.”

⟨254⟩

Sekhiya I M

511

| whatsoever, there is [an offence of] wrong doing.^{1-a}

| But in respect of the regulation beginning with “The provenance (*nidāna*), the individual (*puggala*), the subject matter (*vatthu*)”,² [the rule about] making a hissing sound (Sekh 51) was prescribed at Kosambi (1. *provenance*); the pair [of rules] connected with a drinking-water pot with a hand soiled with food (Sekh 55) and bowl-washing water which has rice grains in it (Sekh 56) [were prescribed] in the Bhagga [country] (= 1. *provenance*) concerning many bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*);³ all the remaining [Sekhiya rules] were prescribed at Sāvatthi (= 1. *provenance*) concerning the group of six bhikkhus (= 2. *individuals*) with respect to the subject matter “wearing [an inner garment] hanging down” (Sekh 1), etc.⁴ (= 3. *subject matter*).

| In respect of asking for curry and gruel (Sekh 37) and the teaching of the Doctrine (Sekh 57–72),⁵ etc. (Sekh 73–75),⁶ there is a single supplementary prescription (*anupaññatti*) by virtue of an illness.

| All [the rules] are prescriptions in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] (= 4. *prescription*).

| They are not connected with commanding [someone else] (= 5. *command*).

| In all of them there is only [an offence of] wrong doing. [I47] There is no other ⟨254⟩ sort of offence (= 6. *[sorts of] offence*).⁷

¹ Cf. the parallel in Sp VI 1212,25f.: *so yam kiñci vikāram karonto dukkaṭā na muccati*. “He who makes any change whatsoever is not freed from [an offence of] wrong doing.”

² These are the first three classification categories of the classification of each Pātimokkha rule, with which the commentary concludes in Kkh. This regulation is explained in detail in connection with the first Pārājika rule (see above, pp. 73ff.).

³ Vin IV 198,18ff.; 199,6ff. (Sekh 55f.).

⁴ The “etc.” stands for the subject matters of all the remaining rules.

⁵ Vin IV 200,9f. (Sekh 57), Vin IV 200,25f. (Sekh 58), Vin IV 200,36f. (Sekh 59), etc.

⁶ Vin IV 205,16f. (Sekh 73), Vin IV 205,25f. (Sekh 74), Vin IV 206,22f. (Sekh 75).

⁷ The non-offence section (= 7. *anāpatti*) has been omitted in this classification, since these cases are mentioned individually at the end of each rule, as is stated below.

512

Bhikkhupātimokha: I. Rules of Training

⟨254⟩

The investigation into failures has been stated already [earlier]¹ (= 8. *failure*).²

We shall show the origin (= 10. [*sorts of*] *origin*), etc.,³ at the end of them all.⁴

But the quantity of non-offence[s] (= 7. *non-offence*) and the constituent factor[s] (= 9. *constituent factors*) are to be stated everywhere (i.e. at the end of each rule).

This is stated⁵ in this rule, first of all:⁶ there is no offence for [one acting] unintentionally, because of forgetfulness, for one not knowing, for one who is ill, in case of disasters, and for one who is insane, etc.⁷

There, “unintentionally” (*asañcicca*, Kkh 254.4) means: b—there is no offence for one wearing [the inner garment] not level all round, not intentionally [acting] thus, “I shall wear [the inner garment] not level all round”, at the same time missing [out on acting thus,] “I shall wear [the inner garment] level all round”.

“Because of forgetfulness” (*assatiyā*, Kkh 254.4) means: there is no offence for one wearing [the inner garment] in that manner [because of forgetfulness], even if he is intent upon something else.

“For one not knowing” (*ajānantassa*, Kkh 254.4) means: b—c—there is no offence for one not knowing to wear [the inner garment] all round, —c—

b—b Sp IV 889,27–31 c—c Sp IV 890,2, quotation from the Kurundī

¹ In the classification of the first Nissaggiya rule it is stated that from now on all the remaining rules are classified as “failure in [right] behaviour” (*ācāravipatti*). This category is no longer mentioned explicitly in the classifications of the following individual rules, see above, p. 201.

² The section mentioning the constituent factors (*aīga*) of an offence (9. *constituent factors*), is missing here, since they are given individually with each individual rule, as is stated below.

³ “etc.” stands for the categories 11 (activity), 12 (awareness), 13 (intention), 14 (faults), 15 (deeds), 16 (thought/mind), and 17 (feelings). For details, see above, pp. 81ff.

⁴ That is, at the end of the Sekhiya section, see below, pp. 543ff. For details, see Appendix 43.

⁵ The full stop after *vuccati* (Kkh 254.3) is to be deleted.

⁶ This refers to the non-offence clause of Sekh 1 in Vin IV 185,22f.

⁷ The “etc.” stands for the *ādikammikassa*, which is mostly replaced by °*ādi*° in Kkh, except for the non-offence clauses of Pār 1 M (Kkh 40,7) and Pāc 8 M (Kkh 149,16).

<255>

Sekhiya 2 M

513

|but d—the manner of wearing is to be grasped.—d e—But whoever has dry
|calves or large flesh of the calves,¹ for him it is suitable to wear [the
|inner garment in that manner] lowering it even eight fingers more for
|the sake of propriety.

|“For one who is ill” (*gilānassa*, Kkh 254.4) means: for whom there
|is a wound on the calve or the foot, it is suitable to wear [the inner gar-
|ment] raising or lowering it.

|“In disasters” (*āpadāsu*, Kkh 254.4) means: wild animals or thieves
|pursue [him]; in disasters of such a kind there is no offence.—e

|“The insane, etc.” [are] indeed of the stated manner (= 7. *no offence*).

|These are the three constituent factors here: (i) disrespect, (ii) the
|absence of any cause of non-offence, (iii) not wearing [the inner garment]
|even all round (= 9. *constituent factors*).

|And as in this connection, so everywhere there are three [constituent
|factors] indeed: the first two (of the three mentioned above) and the
|cause of the obstacle stated here and there.² Therefore, from this point
|onwards, not stating these [factors,] we shall speak only of the quantity
|of non-offence[s].

|[2. The commentary on the second rule about even all round]

|[2. Sekh: *I shall put on [the outer garment] even all round; this is a*
|*training to be practised.*

(Pāt 88.9 = Vin IV 185,²⁷)

|In the second [rule] f—not putting on a householders’ outer garment
(*pāruta*)^f which is rejected thus, “Bhikkhus, a householders’ outer
garment is not to be put on”,³ <255> g—making both corners level, the
outer garment (*pārupana*) is called “the outer garment which is even all
round”.^g h—There, whatever white-clothed one’s outer garment (*pāruta*)
there is, wanderer’s outer garment, one-rober’s garment, drunkard’s outer
garment, harem-woman’s outer garment, great-elder’s (*mahājetṭha*)

d-d ≠ Sp IV 889,₃₂

e-e ≠ Sp IV 890,₃₋₈

f-f Vin II 137,_{13f}

g-g ≠ Sp IV 890,_{15ff.}

h-h ≠ Sp VI 1212,_{29-13,25}

¹ See PoP 340, n. 12.

² Thus, three factors are mentioned for each of the Sekhiyas. The first two are
the same everywhere. Only the third is specific to the respective Sekhiya in
that its malpractice is mentioned.

³ Vin II 137,_{13f}. (BD V 191).

514

Bhikkhupātimokha: I. Rules of Training

⟨255⟩

outer garment, hut-enterer's outer garment, brahman's outer garment, text-maker's outer garment — outer garments such as these, which differ from the characteristic of even all round — all of these are a householder's outer garment.

Therefore, as the white-clothed naked ones (*nigantha*), that are protectors of a half,¹ put on their outer garment; and as some wanderers uncovering their chest place the outer garment² on the two shoulder joints; and as one-robe men covering their back with one end of the cloth (*sātaka*), place both corners on both shoulder joints; and as drunkards, etc., surrounding their neck with a cloth (*sātaka*) either let the two corners hang down on their chest or throw them on their back; and as harem women put on a veil showing only the stars of their eyes; and as great elders (*mahājetṭhā*) wearing a long cloth (*sātaka*) cover the whole body with one end of just it; and as ploughmen entering a hut in the fields twisting the cloth (*sātaka*) up, throwing it under the armpit, cover the body with one end of just it; and as brahmans, inserting the cloth (*sātaka*) between both armpits, throw it on the shoulder joints; and as a text-maker bhikkhu, uncovering his left arm dressed with a one-shoulder outer garment, places the robe on [his] shoulder, thus [I48] not putting on [an outer garment] — avoiding all these and other such faults [of putting on] an outer garment, it is to be put on, level all round, without change.

It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one not putting on [an outer garment] thus in a monastery as well as inside a house, making some change or other out of disrespect.^{3–h} (= 6. [sorts of] offence)

The non-offence is exactly the same as in the previous rule (Sekh 1),⁴ and as in this context, so everywhere. But where there is any difference, we will speak [of it] there (= 7. non-offence).

[3–4. The commentary on the rules about being well covered]

[3. Sekh: *I shall go well covered among the houses* (i.e. *into a village*); [this is] a training to be practised.

(Pāt 88,12 = Vin IV 186,8f.)]

¹ *adḍhapālaka-niganṭhā*; for further information, see Appendix 44.

² *pāvuranam* with v.l. *pārupanam*

³ Kkh 255,24: the comma after *dukkatām* should be replaced by a full stop.

⁴ See above, p. 512.

<256>

Sekhiya 5 M

515

<256> In the third [rule] well covered, (*suppaticchanno*, Pāt 88,12) means well covered (resolution of compound). ⁱ-I shall go among the houses (*antaraghare gamissāmi*, Pāt 88,12) having fastened a block,¹ having covered [my] throat with the end of the hem, having withdrawn [the garment] making both corners level, having covered [the body] as far as the wrist[s], [that is] the meaning.ⁱ

But there is [an offence of] wrong doing for one going not having practised thus, having uncovered his knees and chest (6. [sorts of] offence).

[4. Sekh: *I shall sit well covered among the houses* (i.e. in a village); this is a training to be practised.

(Pāt 88,14f. = Vin IV 186,8f.)]

In the fourth [rule], ^j-one sitting, having uncovered [his] head from the throat [upwards, his] hands from the wrist [downwards, and his] feet from the flesh of the calves [downwards],^j having covered the rest, is indeed one well covered (*suppaticchanno*, Pāt 88,14).

But in this context ^k-there is no offence for one who has gone to his abode^{2-k} (= 7. non-offence).

[5–6. The commentary on the rules about being well restrained]

[5. Sekh: *I shall go well restrained among the houses* (i.e. into a village); this is a training to be practised.

(Pāt 88,17 = Vin IV 186,19f.)

ⁱ⁻ⁱ ≠ Sp IV 890,23–26 ^{j-j} Sp IV 890,27ff. ^{k-k} ≠ Sp IV 890,29ff.

¹ *ganthikam*; allowed for weighting the robes in order to prevent them from being blown up (Vin II 136,27f.). These weights could be made from bone, ivory, horn, reeds, bamboo, stick, lac, crystal, copper, the centre of a conch shell, a thread, and were put in mantles. These were fixed to the robe with some string (*pāsaka*) up to eight finger breadths above the border of the robe.

² *vāsūpagatassa*; in PED s.v. *vāsa*², -ūpagata the following meaning is given: “having entered one’s hut or abode (for the rainy season) Sn 415”. IBH in translating the *anāpatti* clause of Sekh 4 translates, “if he has gone into residence for the rains” (BD V 122). This gives the idea that *vāsūpagacchati* is used only in connection with the rainy season. This, however, is not the case. *Vāsūpagata* probably can refer to any overnight stay in a house. For entering the rainy season, the expression *vassam upa-gacchati* and *upeti* are used.

516

Bhikkhupātimokha: I. Rules of Training

⟨257⟩

6. Sekh: *I shall sit well restrained among the houses* (i.e. in a village); [this is] a training to be practised.

(Pāt 88,17 = Vin IV 186,19f.)]

In the fifth [rule], ^awell restrained (*susamvuto*, Pāt 88,17): not playfully moving hand or foot, well disciplined [is the] meaning.^{-a}

In the sixth [rule] also, exactly this is the manner.

[7–8. The commentary on the rules about downcast eyes]

7. Sekh: *I shall go with downcast eyes among the houses* (i.e. into a village); [this is] a training to be practised.

(Pāt 90,2 = Vin IV 186,29f.)]

8. Sekh: *I shall sit with downcast eyes among the houses* (i.e. in a village); [this is] a training to be practised.

(Pāt 90,4 = Vin IV 186,29f.)]

In the seventh [rule], ^bwith downcast eyes (*okkhittacakkhu*, Pāt 90,2) means: as one with eyes cast downwards,^{-b} looking at a space of ground ahead of a plough's length.¹ ^cBut [when] standing in one place, it is suitable to look for the absence of dangers such as elephants, horses, etc.^{-c}

In the eighth [rule] also, exactly this is the manner. ⟨257⟩

[9–10. The commentary on the rules about [robes] hitched up]

9. Sekh: *I shall not go with [robes] hitched up among the houses* (i.e. into a village); [this is] a training to be practised.

(Pāt 90,7 = Vin IV 187,4f.)]

In the ninth [rule] ^dwith [robes] hitched up (*ukkhittakāya*, Pāt 90,7) means: by hitching up; [this is] the instrumental case for [a person] characterized as being thus.² As one having one's robe hitched up on

^a–^aSp IV 890,31f. ^b–^bSp IV 890,33 ≠ Sn-a I 116,1 ^c–^cSp IV 891,6f.

^d–^dSp IV 891,8–11

¹ Kkh 256,22 the comma after *pekkhamāno* should be replaced by a full stop.

² Pind 1990: 180, refers to the similarity of this explanation and Pāṇini 2,3,21 (*ittham-bhūta-lakṣane*) “[The third case, that is, the instrumental case] is used in the sense of an indication of [someone or something being in] this or that state of condition.”

<257>

Sekhiya I3 M

517

[one side or on both sides, [this is] the meaning. One should not go thus into [the village] from the [gate] post¹ onwards.^{-d}

[10. Sekh: *I shall not sit with [robes] hitched up among the houses* (i.e. *in a village*); [this is] a training to be practised.

(Pāt 90,9f. = Vin IV 187,4f.)]

In the tenth [rule], ^e–even by one taking out a water-pot² at the moment of sitting down, it is to be taken out solely without hitching up his robe.^{-e}

But there is no offence for one who has gone to his abode³ (= 7. non-offence).⁴

[11–12. The commentary on the rules about a loud laugh]

[11. Sekh: *I shall not go with a loud laugh among the houses* (i.e. *into a village*); [this is] a training to be practised.

(Pāt 90,14f. = Vin IV 187,16f.)]

[12. Sekh: *I shall not sit with a loud laugh among the houses* (i.e. *in a village*); [this is] a training to be practised.

(Pāt 90,16f. = Vin IV 187,16f.)]

In the eleventh [rule] the meaning [of] ^f–with a loud laugh (*ujjagghi-kāya*, Pāt 90,14) is: laughing a great laugh.^{-f} Here, too, [this is] the instrumental case for [a person] characterized as being thus.⁵

In the twelfth [rule], also, exactly this is the manner.

In both rules there is no offence for one merely smiling in respect of a matter to be laughed at (= 7. non-offence).

[13–14. The commentary on the rules about a loud sound]

[13. Sekh: *I shall go with low sound among the houses* (i.e. *into a village*); [this is] a training to be practised.

(Pāt 90,19 = Vin IV 187,27f.)

^e–e Sp IV 891,11f. ^f–f Sp IV 891,13

¹ *inda-khila*; see above, p. 95, n. 4.

² Kkh *dhamma-karaṇam*, Sp *dhamma-karakam*; both variants are used for a water vessel.

³ *vāsūpagatassa*; see above, p. 515, n. 2.

⁴ In the Pātimokha and the Vinaya the first ten rules belong to the section about “even all round” (Pāt 90,11; Vin IV 187,12: *parimandalava-gaggo pathamo*).

⁵ In the parallel in Sp IV 891,13f., this is indicated by a cross reference.

518

Bhikkhupātimokha: I. Rules of Training

(258)

14. Sekh: *I shall sit with low sound among the houses (i.e. in a village); [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 90,21 = Vin IV 187,27f.)]

In the thirteenth [rule] with low sound (*appasaddo*, Pāt 90,19) means: not as one of loud sound or great sound.

In the fourteenth [rule], also, exactly this is the manner.

But the [following] is the range of a low sound level (*appa-saddatā*) in this context: (258) if, ^g—in a house of twelve cubits (*hattha**)¹ there is an elder of the Saṅgha (*saṅgha-thera*)² in the front, a second elder in the middle [149] [and] a third elder at the end; among them thus seated, whatever³ the elder of the Saṅgha talks about with the second elder, the second elder hears the sound of it, and he defines the words (*kathā*). But the third elder hears only a sound, he does not define the words. To such an extent it is a low sound (*appa-saddo*). But if the third elder defines the words as well, that is a great sound (*mahā-saddo*).^{—g}

[15–20. The commentary on the rules about swaying the body, etc.]⁴

15. Sekh: *I shall not go swaying [my] body among the houses (i.e. into a village); [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 92,1f. = Vin IV 188,4f.)

16. Sekh: *I shall not sit swaying [my] body among the houses (i.e. in a village); [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 92,4f. = Vin IV 188,4f.)

17. Sekh: *I shall not go swinging [my] arms among the houses (i.e. into a village); [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 92,7f. = Vin IV 188,17f.)

^g—g Sp IV 891,15–21

¹ That is, approximately 5 metres. The expression leaves open whether the measure refers to the length or the width of a house.

² *saṅgha-(t)hera*; see above, pp. 7f., n. 4.

³ Kkh 258,2; Vin-vn-t II 12,18f. read *nisinnesu yam saṅghathero*; Sp IV 891,17; Pālim-nṭ II 14,23 only have *nisinnesu saṅghathero*, and omit the *ca* in the next section of the sentence. The *yam* could either be understood as a sandhi form for *ayam* to be linked with *saṅghathero*, or it is intended as acc. sg. *yam* taken up in the subsequent portion of the sentence by *tassa* (Kkh 258,3). If the latter is the case, then *yam* is the accusative object to *manteti*.

⁴ Rules 17–18 Sekh are the rules about swinging the arms; rules 19–20 the rules about shaking the head.

<258>

Sekhiya 21 M

519

| 18. Sekh: *I shall not sit swinging [my] arms among the houses (i.e. in a village); [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 92,9f. = Vin IV 188,17f.)

| 19. Sekh: *I shall not go shaking [my] head among the houses (i.e. into a village); [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 92,12f. = Vin IV 188,28f.)

| 20. Sekh: *I shall not sit shaking [my] head among the houses (i.e. in a village); [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 92,14f. = Vin IV 188,28f.)]

| In the six [rules] from this on (i.e. from the 15th Sekh onwards, i.e. in Sekh. 15–20), *swaying the body* (*kāyappacālakam*, Pāt 92,1) means: | moving the body again and again. This is the manner everywhere (i.e. in Sekh. 15–20).¹ Therefore, holding the body, etc., straight² [i.e.] making [it, etc.,] motionless (*niccalā*), upright (*ujuka*),³ h—one should go⁴ and one should sit.^{5–h}

| In the three [rules] connected with sitting (Sekh 16, 18, 20) there is no offence for one who has gone to his abode⁶ (= 7. non-offence).⁷

| [21–22. The commentary on the rules about “with arms akimbo”]

| [21. Sekh: *I shall not go with arms akimbo among the houses (i.e. into a village); [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 92,19f. = Vin IV 188,35f.)

h—hSp IV 891,23

¹ In Sekh 15, 16 it is swaying the body (*kāya-ppacālakam*), in Sekh 17, 18 swaying the arms (*bāhu-ppacālakam*), and in Sekh 19, 20 swaying the head (*sīsa-ppacālakam*). Thus it actually is the explanation of *pacālaka* which is relevant for all six rules.

² *paggahetvā*; this takes up the formulation in the Vinaya (Vin IV 188,7, 20).

³ These two words are to be understood as a gloss to the *paggahetvā* used in the Vinaya, above, p. 519, n. 2.

⁴ This refers to Sekh 15, 17, 19.

⁵ This refers to Sekh 16, 18, 20.

⁶ *vāsūpagatassa*; see above, p. 515, n. 2.

⁷ Here ends the second decade of rules called “section about a loud laugh” (Pāt 92,16: *ujjagghika-vaggo dutiyo*), in the Pātimokha and Vinaya editions.

520

Bhikkhupātimokha: I. Rules of Training

⟨259⟩

22. Sekh: *I shall not sit with arms akimbo among the houses (i.e. in a village); [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 92,21f. = Vin IV 188,35f.)]

In the twenty-first and twenty-second [rules] ⁱ-with arms akimbo (*khambhakato*, Pāt 92,19, 21) means: making a prop having placed the hand on the hip.¹⁻ⁱ

[23–24. The commentary on the rules about with head covered]

23. Sekh: *I shall not go with [my] head covered among the houses (i.e. into a village); [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 92,24f. = Vin IV 189,9f.)]

24. Sekh: *I shall not sit with [my] head covered among the houses (i.e. in a village); [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 94,1f. = Vin IV 189,9f.)]

In the twenty-third and twenty-fourth [rules] ^j-with head covered (*ogunthito*, Pāt 92,24; 94,1) means: enrobed including the head.^{2-j}

[25. The commentary on the rule about walking on toes or heels]

25. Sekh: *I shall not go walking on heels or toes among the houses (i.e. into a village); [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 94,4f. = Vin IV 189,19f.)]

⟨259⟩ In the twenty-fifth [rule] ^k-walking on heels or toes (*ukkuṭikā*, ≠ Pāt 94,4) is said concerning the walking of one touching the ground only with the toes,³ having raised [his] heels, or only with the heels⁴ having raised [his] toes.

But here the instrumental case has the stated⁵ characteristic indeed.^{-k}

ⁱ⁻ⁱSp IV 891,26f.

^{j-j}Sp IV 891,27

^{k-k}Sp IV 891,27–30

¹ For the non-offence clause, see below, p. 521 (Sekh 26).

² For the non-offence clause of Sekh 24, see below, p. 521 (Sekh 26).

³ Kkh 259,1 for *aggapāde h' eva* read *aggapādeh' eva*.

⁴ Kkh 259,2 for *pañhī hi yeva* read *pañhīhi yeva*.

⁵ This refers back to Sekh 9, p. 516, n. 2.

<259>

Sekhiya 27 M

521

[26. The commentary on the rule about with [legs] enclosed]

[26. Sekh: *I shall not sit with [legs] enclosed¹ among the houses (i.e. in a village); [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 94,7f. = Vin IV 189,27f.)]

In the twenty-sixth [rule] *not with [legs] enclosed (na pallatthikāya, Pāt 94,7)* means: one should not sit with [legs] enclosed by [one's] hands or [legs] enclosed by [a] cloth.²

It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one sitting [in that manner] out of disrespect (6. [sorts of] offence).

But for one who has gone to his abode,³ here too, and in the twenty-second and twenty-fourth [rules], there is no offence (= 7. non-offence).

The commentary on the twenty-six rules
on proper behaviour is finished.

[2. The commentary on the thirty rules connected with food]⁴

[27 (1).⁵ The commentary on the rule about
formally accepting appreciatively]

[27 (1). Sekh: *I shall formally accept alms food appreciatively; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 94,10f. = Vin IV 190,3f.)]

In the first among the [rules] connected with food ^a-appreciatively (*sakkaccaṁ*, Pāt 94,10) means: producing mindfulness.^{-a}

^{a-a}Sp IV 891,32f.

¹ *pallatthikāya* (*pallatthikā* from *pallatha*, Skt *paryasta* [*pari* + *as*])); the Word Analysis explains this as *hattha-pallatthikāya* (“[the legs] enclosed by [the] hands”) and *dussa-pallatthikāya* (“[the legs] enclosed by [a] garment”) (Vin IV 189,30). This is not rendered by IBH, who simply translates this as “sit ... lolling” (BD III 126). The commentary adds a third option, namely, *āyoga-pallatthikāya* “[the legs] enclosed by [some] bandage” (Sp IV 896,1).

² *dussa-pallatthikā*; see Appendix 45.

³ *vāsūpagatassa*; see above, p. 515, n. 2.

⁴ This heading should be inserted after line Kkh 259,10.

⁵ The commentary begins numbering anew the rules in each section. Accordingly, in addition to the consecutive numbering of all Sekhiya rules, we add this numbering according to section in the Sekhiya sections two and three.

522

Bhikkhupātimokha: I. Rules of Training

⟨260⟩

[28 (2). The commentary on the rule about formally accepting with attention to the bowl]

[28 (2). Sekh: *I shall formally accept alms food with attention to the bowl; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 94,13f. = Vin IV 190,13f.)]

In the second [rule] attention to the bowl (*patta-saññā*) means attention to the bowl (resolution of compound); one [who] has this [attention is one] *with attention to the bowl* (*pattasaññī*, Pāt 94,13). The meaning is: as one having attention connected to his own bowl.

[29 (3). The commentary on the rule about formally accepting curry in proportion]

[29 (3). Sekh: *I shall formally accept alms food with curry in proportion; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 94,16f. = Vin IV 190,23f.)] ⟨260⟩

In the third [rule] b—with curry in proportion (*samasūpako*, ≠ Pāt 94,16) means: where^b curry [that] may be carried by hand, made from beans (*māsa*) and kidney beans (*mugga*) or from vetches, etc., is a fourth part of the meal.

It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one taking more than this (6. [sorts of] offence).

But putting curry (*sūpa*) aside, all the remaining sorts of curry condiments (*sūpeyyabyañjana*) are called various types of sauces.¹

Here there is no offence in respect of these various types of sauces, [for those who accept] from relatives, or from those [by whom they] have been invited, or for the sake of another, or with one's own resources (= 7. non-offence).²

^b—Sp IV 891,33–92,1

¹ Kkh-nṭ 440,8f.: *sabbāpi sūpeyyabyañjanavikatī ti* (Kkh 260,4) *oloñi-sāka-sūpeyya-maccha-mainśa-rasādikā* *sabbāpi sūpeyyabyañjanavikati*. “All sorts of curry condiments means: all sorts of curry condiments such as *oloñi* (curds) sauce, vegetable curry (*sāka*), fish sauce, meat sauce, etc.”

² Thānissaro (2007: I 531) states that Kkh understands all these non-offences to apply only to dishes that are not bean curries (*sūpa*), that is, to the condiments called *rasa-rasa* (Kkh 260,4). Here he obviously misunderstood the Kkh text which, exactly like the Vinaya (Vin IV 190,28), lists *rasa-rase* as one element

Page 571 job: 1272818

⟨260⟩ *Sekhiya 32 M* 523

[30–32 (4–6). The commentary on the rule about level with the edge,¹ etc.]²

[30 (4). Sekh: *I shall formally accept alms food level with the edge [of the bowl; this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 94,19f. = Vin IV 190,34f.)

31 (5). Sekh: *I shall eat alms food appreciatively; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 94,24f. = Vin IV 191,9f.)

32 (6). Sekh: *I shall eat alms food with attention to the bowl; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 96,2f. = Vin IV 191,19f.)]

In the fourth [rule] ^c-level with the edge [of the bowl] (*samatitthikam*,³ Pāt 94,19) means: filled to the level, loaded to the level; ^c-arranged, not going beyond the mark inside the rim of the mouth of the bowl that is suitable for being formally taken possession of.⁴

*Alms food (piṇḍapāṭam, Pāt 94,19) means: whatever is [food that is allowed during the time period] up to the [right] time (*yāva-kālika*).⁵ But in [a bowl] not suitable for being formally taken possession of, [food that is allowed during the time period] up to the [right] time (*yāva-kālika*) and [edibles allowed] during a watch of the night (*yāma-kālika*),*

^{c-c}Sp IV 892,6f.

in the non-offence clause. Therefore, contrary to what he says, there is no contradiction between Kkh and Vin.

¹ *samatittika-sikkhāpadam*; referred to as *thūpīkata-piṇḍapāṭa[-sikkhāpada]* at Sp IV 898,33.

² Kkh 260,6 should read *samatitt(h)ikādi-sikkhāpada-vanjanā*, since Sekh 31 is the rule about eating appreciatively, and Sekh 32 is the rule about eating with attention to the bowl.

³ Kkh 260,9 *samatittikan* is to be corrected to *samatithikan*.

⁴ *adhitthānupaga-patta*; this means that the bowl has to fulfil all the conditions concerning material and size as defined in the Vinaya, see above, pp. 250ff.

⁵ By this definition, the other types of edibles (*yāma-kālika*, *sattāha-kālika*, *yāva-jīvika*) are exempted from this rule. This is made explicit at Sp IV 892,27f., where it is stated that these three types of edibles are suitable as ones heaped up, even in a bowl which is suitable for being formally taken possession of (*yāmakālika-sattāhakālika-yāvajīvikāni pana adhitthānūpage patte pi thūpīkata-tāni vattanti*).

524

Bhikkhupātimokha: I. Rules of Training

⟨260⟩

etc., are suitable wherever¹ [they are placed], even [when they are] heaped up. But whatever — having received [it]^d—in two bowls, having filled one [bowl with that]² — he takes to the vihāra,^{3–d} [that is not called heaped up]; or ^ewhatever cake, piece of sugar-cane, different sorts of fruit, etc., having being thrown into [the bowl], go down below^{–e} [the edge of the bowl, that is not called heaped up]; or garlandes of berries [from the *kakkola* plant],⁴ etc., which are given by placing them above [the edge of the bowl, are not called heaped up]; and whatever, having been thrown ^f—into a leaf or a dish, is placed on top^{5–f} of the bowl, that is not called heaped up. Therefore all that is suitable.

But here⁶ there is no non-offence, even for one who is ill; therefore even by him, it is to be taken only level with the edge.

^{d–d}Sp IV 892,28f. ^{e–e} ≠ Sp IV 892,30f. ^{f–f} ≠ Sp IV 893,2f.

¹ Kkh-nt 440,17f. states that “wherever” (*yattha katthaci*) here means in whatever bowl, either suitable or not suitable for being formally taken possession of. The introductory statement in the Kkh sentence refers to “[a bowl] which is not suitable for being formally taken possession of” (*anadhiṭṭhānupāge*). It is probably to be understood that food that is allowed even though it is in an unsuitable bowl is all the more allowed when it is in a suitable bowl.

² Sp IV 892,29 reads *ekasmim pūretvā* (“having filled [that] into one [bowl]”) for *ekam pūretvā* (Kkh 260,13). In Sp this is characterised as a quotation from the Mahāpaccarī (Sp IV 892,29f.).

³ The parallel in Sp slightly deviates and is marked as a quotation from the Mahāpaccarī.

⁴ Kkh-nt 441,1–4: *takkolavaṭaṁsaṅkādayo ti* (Kkh 260,15) *ettha matthake ṭhapita-takkolam eva vaṭamsakasadasitā takkolavaṭaṁsakaṁ. ādi-saddena pupphavaṭamsaka-kaṭukaphalādivaṭamsakānām gahanam, na tam thūpikatam nāma hoti pātekkam bhājanattā paññādinām.* “Garlands of the berries [from the *kakkola* plant] means: in this context the mere *takkola* [berries] placed on top are garlands of *takkola* berries, because of their similarity to garlands. By the word ‘etc.’ [there is] inclusion of flower garlands, *nimba*, and fruit garlands, etc.; they are not called heaped up because the leaves, etc., are distributed separately.”

⁵ The slightly deviating parallel in Sp is marked as a quotation from the Kurundī.

⁶ This is stated in the commentary to Sekh 30–34 (Kkh 260,17f.). Only Sekh 30 deals with the question of level with the edge. Thus one would normally assume that the “here” (*idha*, Kkh 260,17) refers to Sekh 30 (*samatitthikasikkhāpada*). But in Sp IV 898,33 only three rules among the Sekhiyas are listed where there is no non-offence for a bhikkhu who is ill, namely the

Page 573 job: 1272818

⟨260⟩ *Sekhiya 33 M* 525

g—But everywhere [150] only to formally accept is not suitable; [if something of such a type] has been formally accepted, however, [it is] formally well accepted, [and] it is suitable to eat it.^{1—g}

The fifth (Sekh 31) and the sixth (Sekh 32) rules are exactly of the stated manner.

[33–34 (7–8). The commentary on the rule about in regular order, etc.]²

[33 (7). Sekh: *I shall eat alms food in regular order*;³ [this is] a training to be practised.

(Pāt 96,5f. = Vin IV 191,28f.)

g—g≠ Sp IV 893,5ff.

thūpīkata-piṇḍapāta[-sikkhāpada] (Sekh 35, called *na-thūpakata-sikkhāpadam* in Pāt 96,10, *thūpakata-sikkhāpadam* in Kkh 261,3), the *sūpa-vyañjanapaṭicchādāna* (Sp B^e *sūpabyañjanena paṭicchādānam*, Sp IV 898,34) (Sekh 36, called *odana-paṭicchādāna-sikkhāpada* exclusively in Pāt 96,13, Kkh 261,8, and Kkh-nṭ 441,12, 16), and the *ujjhāna-saññī-sikkhāpada* (Sekh 38). Furthermore, Sp also gives the statements as above in the commentary on words from Sekh 30, and states in this context too that “here in the non-offence [clause the mention of] a [bhikkhu] who is ill is not handed down. Therefore [almsfood] made into a *thūpa* is not suitable [even for bhikkhu who is ill]” (Sp IV 893,3ff.: *idha anāpattiyañ gilāno na āgato, tasmā thūpikatañ na vatñati*). Since Sekh 30 and 35 deal with the same matter from two different angles (see below, p. 525, n. 1) the “here” in the commentary to Sekh 30 in Sp and Kkh actually refers to Sekh 35. The connection of these two rules is also reflected by the fact that Kkh-nṭ comments only on Sekh 30, and skips Sekh 35, jumping directly from Sekh 34 to Sekh 36 (Kkh-nṭ 441).

¹ Sekh 30 deals only with the formal acceptance (*paṭigghahana*) of food that is heaped up beyond the rim of the bowl, not with eating such food. So if one formally accepts such food, it is an offence of wrong doing because of the transgression of Sekh 30. When one then eats that food, there is no offence since the rule does not cover this. Sekh 35, which deals with such food too, also does not prohibit eating it, but only restricts the manner in which to eat it (see below, p. 526).

² Kkh 260,22 should be *sapadānādi-sikkhāpada-vaññanā*, since Sekh 34 (8), the rule about equal curry, is included.

³ *sapadānam*, “without interruption” or “in regular order”. In the introductory story the six bad monks eat the almsfood “picking here and there” (*taham taham omadditvā*), probably taking first what they like most. The verb *omaddati* is

526

Bhikkhupātimokha: I. Rules of Training

⟨261⟩

34 (8). Sekh: *I shall eat alms food with curry in proportion; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 96,8f. = Vin IV 191,28f.)]

In the seventh [rule], ^h-*in regular order* (*sapadānam*, Pāt 96,5) means: not having made a terminal point (*odhi*) here and there, successively.^{-h}

But whoever, either giving to others or piling up into another's bowl, picks from here and there, ⟨261⟩ for him, and even for one taking titbits out of regular order, there is no offence here (= 7. *non-offence*).

The eighth [rule] is of the stated manner.

[35 (9). The commentary on the rule about having crushed a heap (or having crushed [it] in a heap)]

[35 (9). Sekh: *I shall not eat alms food having crushed a heap (or having crushed [it] in a heap);¹ [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 96,11f. = Vin IV 192,15f.)²

In the ninth [rule] ⁱ-*thūpakato* (v.l. *thūpato*, Pāt 96,11) means: from the top, from the middle.⁻ⁱ

But whoever — having dragged together the small pieces left over, having drawn them together at one and the same point — eats [them], having crushed [them], for him too there is no offence³ (= 7. *non-offence*).

^{h-h}Sp IV 893,9 ⁱ⁻ⁱSp IV 893,10f.

used in a variety of meanings (CPD s.v.; DOP s.v.). In the non-offence clause to Sekh 33, the verb *omasati* is used instead (Vin IV 191,34), where “picking” is allowed if a bhikkhu picks something from his own bowl for giving it to someone else. Sekh 33 thus prescribes eating in regular order, not picking from one place or another.

¹ For this expression, see Appendix 46.

² Barea (1962: 271) understood this rule as a prohibition “de faire un *stūpa* avec la nourriture puis de le démolir et de le manger”. In light of the rules in other schools' Prātimokṣas (see Appendix 46), this seems to be closer to the point. This has been stated and discussed already by Schopen, who examined these rules and the parallels to some extent (Schopen 2004: 33ff.). If that was the original meaning, then this was no longer understood at the time of the commentaries, as the explanation of the rule here shows.

³ This is literally listed in the non-offence clause of the Vinaya (Vin IV 192,20f.). It cannot be excluded that *omadditvā* here is used in the sense of “picked”, which would require a change in the translation of the rule.

⟨261⟩*I. Sekhiya 37 M*

527

[36 (10). The commentary on the rule about hiding with rice]¹

[36 (10). Sekh: *I shall not hide curry or condiment with rice because of a desire to get more; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 96,14f. = Vin IV 192,27f.)]

In the tenth [rule] there is no offence for those to whom the food owners give at the time when there is an injunction against slaughter, etc., by covering up the condiment, and whoever does not cover up with the desire for more (= 7. non-offence).

But for an ill man, it is an offence indeed,² because of him not having been handed down [as an exception in the Vibhaṅga] (6. [sorts of] offence).

[37 (11). The commentary on the rule about asking for curry and rice]

[37 (11). Sekh: *I shall not, when not ill, eat curry or rice I have asked for myself; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 96,18f. = Vin IV 193,30f.)]

In the eleventh [rule] the [following] is an addition to the non-offence[-clause:³, there is no offence for] relatives, or those [who have been] invited, or for the sake of another, or with one's own resources.⁴ (= 7. non-offence).

¹ *odana-paṭīcchādana-sikkhāpada*; this rule is referred to by *sūpa-vyañjanapaṭīcchādana[-sikkhāpada]* (v.l. °*vyañjanena pa*°) (Sp IV 898,34), see above, pp. 524f., n. 6.

² Sp IV 898,34, explicitly mentions this rule as having no non-offence for a bhikkhu who is ill, see above, pp. 524f., n. 6.

³ These non-offence cases that are designated as an addition to the non-offence clause, are in fact part of the non-offence clause in the Vinaya (Vin IV 193,36ff., BD III 132). Possibly these cases were not part of the non-offence clause of the Vinaya in the time of the commentary. Cf. p. 531, n. 1; p. 534, n. 1; p. 543, n. 2.

⁴ Actually, this would be excluded already by the formulation of the rule. Perhaps this non-offence case was simply taken over from other rules.

528

Bhikkhupātimokha: I. Rules of Training

⟨262⟩

[38 (12). The commentary on the rule about one having the idea of fault-finding]

[38 (12). Sekh: *I shall not look at the bowl of others having the idea of fault-finding; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 96,21f. = Vin IV 194,27f.)]

In the twelfth [rule] an idea concerning fault-finding (resolution of compound) is an idea of fault-finding (*ujjhāna-saññā*); one [who] has this [idea is] one who has the idea of fault-finding (*ujjhānasaññī*, Pāt 96,21).

Here too¹ j-an ill person is not released^j [from an offence].

But there is no offence for one looking [with the thought,] “I shall give” or “I shall cause to give”, and for one who does not have the idea of fault-finding (= 7. non-offence). ⟨262⟩

[39 (13). The commentary on the rule about a mouthful]

[39 (13). Sekh: *I shall not make too large a mouthful;*² [this is] a training to be practised.

(Pāt 96,24f. = Vin IV 194,15f.)]

In the thirteenth [rule] *not too large* (*nātimahantam*, Pāt 96,24) means: k-a peacock egg is too large, a hen’s egg is too small, a measure in between these.³

But there is no offence in respect of all solid foods, divided into roots, solid food, etc., and different sorts of fruit.⁴

[40 (14). The commentary on the rule about a morsel]

[40 (14). Sekh: *I shall make an appropriate⁴ morsel;*⁵ [this is] a training to be practised.

(Pāt 98,2 = Vin IV 194,25f.)]

j-j Sp IV 893,13f. k-k Sp IV 893,14f.

¹ As in Sekh 35, and 36, see above, pp. 524f., n. 6.

² *kabala*; *kabala* is used in a line of synonyms together with *ālopa* (It 18,23f.); or is explained to mean *ālopa* (Pv-a 70,19; Vin-vn-t II 18,7; Pāc-y 66,15; 627,16); for further details, see Nāṇātusita 2014: 311.

³ Vin IV 194,29f. simply mentions *khajjake* (without further diversification) and *phalāphale*. Cf. Sp IV 893,16f.

⁴ *parimandalam*; that is, neither too large nor too small. See Hu-von Hinüber 1994: 295, n. 1. The commentary possibly based his explanation on the literal meaning “round” when expaining it as “not long”.

⁵ *ālopa*; used as a synonym to *kabala*, see above, p. 528, n. 2.

Page 577 job: 1272818

⟨263⟩ *Sekhiya 43 M* 529

In the fourteenth [rule] *appropriate* (*parimandalam*, Pāt 98,1) means: not long.

But here there is no offence even in respect of titbits together with solid food and different sorts of fruit¹ (= 7. *non-offence*).

[41 (15). The commentary on the rule about not [yet] brought]²

[41 (15). Sekh: *I shall not open the mouth*³ when the mouthful is not [yet] brought to it; [this is] a training to be practised.

(Pāt 98,7f. = Vin IV 195,1f.)]

In the fifteenth [rule] ^a–not [yet] brought (*anāhate*, Pāt 98,7) means: not [yet] brought (*anāharite*); the meaning is: not arrived at the mouth.^{–a}

[42 (16). The commentary on the rule about while eating]⁴

[42 (16). Sekh: *I shall not put the whole hand into the mouth while eating*; [this is] a training to be practised.

(Pāt 98,10f. = Vin IV 195,10f.)]

In the sixteenth [rule] ^b–whole hand (≠ *sabbam hattham*, Pāt 98,10) means: the entire hand.^{–b}

[43 (17). The commentary on the rule about [filled] with mouthfuls]

[43 (17). Sekh: *I shall not speak with the mouth [filled] with mouthfuls*; [this is] a training to be practised.

(Pāt 98,13 = Vin IV 195,19f.)]

In the seventeenth [rule] ^c–[filled] with mouthfuls (*sakabalena*, Pāt 98,13): in this context,^{–c} the extent to which an utterance becomes defective, to that extent there is an offence for the speaker.

But whoever ^d–[when] speaking the Doctrine ⟨263⟩ speaks having put herbs, etc.,⁵ into [his] mouth, with [only] so much an utterance does

^a–^a ≠ Sp IV 893,18 ^b–^b Sp IV 893,19 ^c–^c Sp IV 893,19 ^d–^d ≠ Sp IV 893,20ff.

¹ Vin IV 194,29f. lists all three separately (*khajake*, *phalāphale*, *uttaribhaṅge*).

² Kkh 162,12: for “41–42 (15–16)” read “41 (15)”

³ *mukha-dvāram*, literally “the opening of the mouth”; see above, p. 386.

⁴ After Kkh 262,16 a heading has to be inserted: “[42 (16). *bhuñjamāna-sikkhā-pada-vanṇanā*]”.

⁵ *hariṭakādīni*; *hariṭaka*, also stays for the yellow myrobalane, and for any kind of greens; Sp IV 893,20 reads *hariṭakam vā laṭṭhimadhukam vā*, “herbs or liquorice”.

530

Bhikkhupātimokha: I. Rules of Training

⟨263⟩

not become defective, there being [only] so much in [his] mouth, it is suitable.^{-d}

[44 (18). The commentary on the rule about lifted balls [of food]

[44 (18). Sekh: *I shall not eat lifted balls¹ [of food;² this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 98,16 = Vin IV 195,27f.)]

In the eighteenth [rule] ^e-lifted balls [of food] (*pindukkhepakam*, Pāt 98,16) means: having repeatedly lifted a ball [of food].^{-e}

Here too there is no offence in respect of solid food and different sorts of fruit (= 7. non-offence).

[45 (19). The commentary on the rule about biting off a mouthful]

[45 (19). Sekh: *I shall not eat biting off a mouthful; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 98,19 = Vin IV 196,1f.)]

In the nineteenth [rule] ^f-biting off a mouthful (*kabalāvacchedakam*, Pāt 98,19) means: repeatedly biting off a mouthful.^{-f}

Here there is no offence, even in the case of titbits together with solid food and different sorts of fruit (= 7. non-offence).

[46 (20). The commentary on the rule about stuffing [the cheeks] full]

[46 (20). Sekh: *I shall not eat stuffing the cheeks full; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 98,22 = Vin IV 196,11f.)]

^e-eSp IV 893,22f. ^f-fSp IV 893,23f.

¹ *pindukkhepaka*; “lifted balls” (Thānissaro 2007: I 536); “repeatedly lifting up the [same piece of] food” (Pāt 1966: 78). Others interpret the *ukkanepaka* as “tossing up” (IBH, BD III 135; Nānātusita 2014: 314), “tossing into” (Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, *VinTexts* I 64). As Thānissaro explains, “One should not lift food from the bowl in one hand and then use the other hand to take parts of that handful to put in the mouth.” It is especially the non-offence clause, which exempts solid food and fruit from this rule, that made Thānissaro assume this meaning. As he says, it is “unlikely that there would be an allowance for tossing fruit, etc.” The commentaries are not helpful.

² The difference to the preceding rule would be that one bites off pieces of a mouthful instead of putting it into one’s mouth in one piece. See also Thānissaro 2007: I 536.

Page 579 job: 1272818

⟨264⟩ *Sekhiya 49 M* 531

In the twentieth [rule] ^g-stuffing the cheeks full (*avagandakārakam*, Pāt 98,₂₂) means: repeatedly making [the cheeks] stuffed full like a monkey.^{-g}

Here there is no offence concerning the size of different sorts of fruit (= 7. non-offence).

[47 (21). The commentary on the rule about shaking the hand to and fro]

[47 (21). Sekh: *I shall not eat shaking the hand to and fro; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 100,₂ = Vin IV 196,_{21f.})]

In the twenty-first [rule] ^h-shaking the hand to and fro (*hattha-niddhunakam*, Pāt 100,₂) means: repeatedly shaking the hand to and fro.^{-h}

But in respect of the non-offence [clause] the [following] is an addition here:¹ i-“[no offence in] shaking the hand to and fro while throwing away scrubs”⁻ⁱ (= 7. non-offence). ⟨264⟩

[48 (22). The commentary on the rule about scattering rice grains about]

[48 (22). Sekh: *I shall not eat scattering rice grains about; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 100,₅ = Vin IV 196,_{31f.})]

In the twenty-second [rule] ^j-scattering rice grains about (*sithāvaka-rakam*, Pāt 100,₅) means: repeatedly scattering rice grains about.^{-j}

Here too the [following] is an addition to the non-offence [clause]:
^k-“[no offence in] throwing rice grains away while throwing away scrubs”^{-k} (= 7. non-offence).

[49 (23). The commentary on the rule about sticking out the tongue]

[49 (23). Sekh: *I shall not eat sticking out the tongue; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 100,₈ = Vin IV 197,_{6f.})]

^{g-g}Sp IV 893,_{24f.} ^{h-h}Sp IV 893,_{25f.} ⁱ⁻ⁱVin IV 196,_{5f.} ^{j-j}Sp IV 893,_{26f.}

^{k-k}Vin IV 196,_{35-97,1}

¹ This matter is mentioned in the non-offence clause in the Vinaya already (Vin IV 196,_{25f.}). Whether the commentator mentions it as an addition, because it was not included in the Vinaya version at his hands, remains unclear. Cf. p. 527, n. 3; p. 534, n. 1; p. 543, n. 2.

532

Bhikkhupātimokha: I. Rules of Training

⟨264⟩

In the twenty-third [rule] ^a—sticking out the tongue (*jivhānicchārakam*, Pāt 100,8) means: repeatedly sticking out the tongue.^{—a}

[50–51 (24–25). The commentary on the rule about making a smacking sound, etc.]¹

[50 (24). Sekh: *I shall not eat making a smacking (capucapu) [sound; this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 100,11 = Vin IV 197,13f.)

51 (25). Sekh: *I shall not eat making a slurping (surusuru) [sound; this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 100,16 = Vin IV 197,34f.)

In the twenty-fourth [rule] ^b—making a smacking [sound] (*capucapukārakam*, Pāt 100,11) means: repeatedly making the sound “capu”.^{—b}

In the twenty-fifth [rule] also exactly this is the manner.

[52–54. The commentary on the rule about licking the hand, etc.]⁴

[52 (26). Sekh: *I shall not eat licking the hand; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 100,19 = Vin IV 198,5f.)

53 (27). Sekh.: *I shall not eat licking the bowl; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 100,22 = Vin IV 198,11f.)

54 (28). Sekh.: *I shall not eat licking the lips; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 102,2 = Vin IV 198,17)]

^a—^aSp IV 893,27f. ^b—^bSp IV 893,28f.

¹ In Kkh 264,12 it should be read *capucapukārakādi-sikkhāpada-vanṇanā*, since Sekh 51 (25), the rule about making a slurping sound (*surusurukāraka-sikkhāpada*), is included.

² Translated as a sound produced by “smacking the lips” (IBH, BD III 137; Thānissaro 2007: I 537), or as making “chomping [sounds]” (Ñānatusita 2014: 316).

³ Translated as a “hissing sound” (IBH, BD III 138) and as a “slurping noise” (Thānissaro 2007: I 537; Ñānatusita 2014: 317).

⁴ Sekh 53 (27), the rule about licking the bowl, and Sekh 54 (28) the rule about licking the lips are included.

⟨265⟩*Sekhiya 56 M*

533

In the twenty-sixth [rule] ^c-licking the hand (*hatthanillekhakam*, Pāt 100,₁₉) means: repeatedly licking the hand. **⟨265⟩** For it is not suitable for one who is eating [151] to lick even a mere finger. But having taken thick gruel (*ghana-yāgu*), sugar syrup (*phāṇita*), porridge (*pāyāsa*), etc., with the fingers, it is suitable to eat putting the fingers in the mouth.^{-c}

In the twenty-seventh [rule¹ and] the twenty-eighth [rule] ^d-also, exactly this is the manner.

Therefore, a bowl must not be scraped even with a single finger, and even one lip must not be licked with the tongue, but having taken [the food] only with the flesh of the lips, it is suitable to put it inside.^{-d}

[55 (29). The commentary on the rule about soiled by food]

[55 (29). Sekh: *I shall not formally accept a drinking pot with a hand soiled by food; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 102,_{5f.} = Vin IV 198,_{34f.})]

In the twenty-ninth [rule] ^e-not [...] soiled by food (*na sāmisena*, Pāt 102,₅) means: this is rejected by virtue of being loathsome. Therefore a shell, a cup, a bowl, belonging to the Saṅgha, belonging to an individual, or a householder, or oneself, is not to be taken [with a hand soiled by food]. It is [an offence of] wrong doing for one taking [it]. But if one part of the hand is not soiled by food, it is suitable to take [it] with that part.^{-e}

Here the [following] is an addition to the non-offence [clause]: f-“[There is no offence if a bhikkhu] formally accepts [it thinking], ‘I shall wash it’ or ‘I shall have it washed’ ”^{-f} (= 7. non-offence).

[56 (30). The commentary on the rule about “with rice grains”]

[56 (30). Sekh.: *I shall not throw away bowl-rinsing [water] with rice grains in it among the houses (i.e. in a village); [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 102,_{8f.} = Vin IV 199,_{15f.})]

^{c-c}Sp IV 894,₃₋₇ ^{d-d}Sp IV 894,_{8ff.} ^{e-e}≠ Sp IV 894,₁₄₋₁₉ ^{f-f}Vin IV 199,_{4f.}

¹ Licking (*nillehaka*) in connection with a bowl also includes scraping the bowl with a finger, see the example below. Cf. Thānissaro 2007: I 538.

In the thirtieth [rule] the [following] is an addition to the non-offence [clause]:¹ “[There is no offence if] he throws away [bowl-rinsing water] having removed (*uddharitvā*) or having squashed (*bhinditvā*) [the rice grains], or [if he throws it away] into a receptacle (*paṭiggahe*), or [if he throws it away] having taken [it] out (*nīharitvā*).”²

There g—“or having removed” (*uddharitvā vā*, Kkh 265,¹⁹; Vin IV 199,^{20f.}) means: having removed the rice grains from the water, having made [them into] a heap in one place, he throws the water away.

“Or having squashed” (*bhinditvā vā*, Kkh 265,¹⁹; Vin IV 199,²¹) means: having squashed the rice grains, having made them turn liquid, he throws [it] away. ⟨266⟩

“Or in a receptacle” (*paṭiggahe vā*, Kkh 265,¹⁹; ≠ Vin IV 199,²¹),³ means: receiving⁴ [it] with a receivable he throws it out in that receptacle.⁵

g—gSp IV 894,^{19–24}

¹ Although it is described as an addition to the non-offence clause in the commentary, it is already part of the non-offence clause as handed down in the Vinaya. Compare also the other cases where the commentator makes similar statements. Cf. p. 527, n. 3; p. 531, n. 1; p. 543, n. 2.

² Vin IV 199,^{20f.} (BD III 140).

³ Vin E^e reads *paṭigahetvā*, which better fits the enumeration of the other absolutives, but does not make sense from the point of view of content. Vin B^e C^e S^e, and all commentaries confirm the reading *paṭiggahe*, which is further corroborated by the description of the protocol in case there is a person with a receivable in the Cullavagga (Vin II 214,^{31f.}; see also Thānissaro 2007: I 539). But see Vin-vn v. 1929 *gahetvā*.

⁴ Kkh 266,1: *paṭicchantānam*; Sp E^e IV 894,²² *paṭicchannāniṃ* (v.l. *paṭicchantāniṃ*, *paṭicchanto nam*); Sp B^e C^e S^e *paṭicchanto nam*; the parallel in Pālim-nṭ (II 17,26) has: *sampaṭichanto nam*. We can safely assume that the reading of Kkh 266,1 and of Sp E^e are both wrong, and that a *paṭicchanto nam* has to be read here.

⁵ Vin-vn-t II 20,^{25f.}: *gahetvā ti* (Vin-vn v. 1929) *sasitthakam pattadhovanodakam gahetvā paṭiggahe chaddentassa anāpatti*. “There is no offence for one who, having taken the bowl-rinsing water with the rice grains, throws it in a receptacle [for water].”

⟨266⟩

Sekhiya 57 M

535

“Having taken [it] out” (*nīharityā*, Kkh 265,¹⁹; Vin IV 199,²¹) means: he throws it away having taken it outside.¹ There is no offence for one throwing it away thus.^{-g} (7. = *non-offence*)

The commentary on the thirty rules connected with food is finished.

[3. The commentary on the nineteen rules connected with teaching the Doctrine]²

[57 (1). The commentary on the rule about one with an umbrella in his hand]

[57 (1). Sekh.: *I shall not teach the Doctrine to one with an umbrella in his hand [who is] not ill; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 102,^{11f} = Vin IV 200,^{9f})]

In the first among the [rules] connected with teaching the Doctrine h—“with an umbrella in his hand” (*chattapāṇi*) means: whatever umbrella there is in his hand. So long as he, even if he has placed that umbrella on whatsoever limb of the body, does not release it from his hand, for so long it is not suitable to teach the Doctrine to him. But if another carries the umbrella for him, or if it stands by his side, the moment it has left his hand he is not one “with an umbrella in his hand”;³ it is suitable to teach [the Doctrine] to him.

And the range of Doctrine in this context is to be understood exactly in the manner stated in the [rule about reciting] the Doctrine word by word (Pāc 4 M).^{-h}

^{h-h} ≠ Sp IV 894,³⁰–95,⁴

¹ From the commentaries only Vin-vn-ṭ II 20,²⁶–21,¹ tells us more: *sasitthakam pāttadho vanodakaṁ gharā bahi nīharityā antaraghare chaddentassa anāpatti ti ...* “There is no offence for one who, having taken the bowl-rinsing water with the rice grains outside the house, throwing [it] out among the houses ...”.

² Dhamma (rendered as Doctrine here) in this context is used in the meaning defined in Pāc 4 M; see above, pp. 285f. (see also Thānissaro 2007: I 541). This heading should be added after Kkh 266,³.

³ Kkh 266,¹¹, replace the full stop after *hoti* with a comma.

536

Bhikkhupātimokha: I. Rules of Training

⟨267⟩

[58–59 (2–3). The commentary on the rules about
one with a staff in his hand, etc.]¹

[58 (2). Sekh: *I shall not teach the Doctrine to one with a staff in his hand [who is] not ill; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 102,14f. = Vin IV 200,25f.)

59 (3). Sekh: *I shall not teach the Doctrine to one with a knife in his hand [who is] not ill; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 102,17f. = Vin IV 200,36f.)]

In the second [rule] ⁱ—“staff” (*daṇḍa*) means: [it] has the size of four cubits (*hattha**) of an average man.² But being with a staff in his hand is to be understood exactly in the manner stated in respect of one with an umbrella in his hand.³

In the third [rule] (Sekh 59) also, exactly this is the manner. For even one standing having tied on a sword does not count as one with a knife in his hand.^{–i} ⟨267⟩

[60. The commentary on the rule about one with a weapon in his hand]

[60 (4). Sekh: *I shall not teach the Doctrine to one with a weapon in his hand [who is] not ill; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 102,20f. = Vin IV 201,6)]

In the fourth [rule] ^j—all varieties of bows together with a variety of arrows is to be understood as “weapon” (*āvudhaṇ*). Therefore it is not suitable to teach the Doctrine to one standing or sitting having taken a bow together with an arrow, or just a bow or just an arrow, or a bow with a bowstring or a bow without a bowstring. But if the bow is fastened even on his back, as long as he does not hold it, for so long it is suitable.^{–j}

^{i–i}Sp IV 895,5–8 ^{j–j}≠ Sp IV 895,10–16

¹ The “etc.” covers the one with a “knife in his hand”.

² This takes up the definition in the Word Analysis (Vin IV 200,27: *daṇḍo nāma majjhimassa purisassa catuhattho daṇḍo*). See von Hinüber 1992b: 68f., for the interpretation of this rule in later times.

³ See above, p. 535 (Sekh 57).

Page 585 job: 1272818

⟨267⟩ *Sekhiya 62 M* 537

[61–62 (5–6). The commentary on the rule
about [non-leather] footwear, etc.]¹

[61 (5). Sekh: *I shall not teach the Doctrine to one wearing [non-leather]*
footwear [who is] not ill; [this is] a training to be practised.

(Pāt 104,3f. = Vin IV 201,14f.)

[62 (6). Sekh: *I shall not teach the Doctrine to one wearing [leather]*
footwear² [who is] not ill; [this is] a training to be practised.³

(Pāt 104,3f. = Vin IV 201,14f.)

In the fifth [rule] ^k–to one wearing [non-leather] footwear (*pādukā–rulhassa*, Pāt 104,3) means: (1) to one who, not having inserted the toe interspace⁴ into the grass (?)⁵ peg,⁶ only^{–k} has mounted on [the footwear],

¹ k–k ≠ Sp IV 895,17f.

² The “etc.” stands for Sekh 62 (6), the rule about footwear (*upāhanā*, see below, p. 537, n. 2).

³ *upāhanā*; the word *upāhanā* is translated with “sandal” by IBH (in distinction from *pādukā*, rendered by shoe), which also is the meaning given in CPD, DOP, PED. As stated by Gräfe the differentiation of *upāhanā* and *pādukā* as “sandal” and “shoe” has no basis in the Vinaya. Rather the differentiation lies in the material from which they are made. *Upāhanās* are not made from metal or other hard materials but from various sorts of grass and leather. The *pādukās*, on the other hand, are made from wood, metal, or jewels (Gräfe 1974: §§8.11–12; 17.5). The same differentiation is mentioned by Thānissaro 2007: I 542, who translates *pādukā* as “non-leather footwear”, and *upāhanā* as “leather footwear”. Nānatusita (2014: 321) refers to the latter’s differentiation.

⁴ Sekh 62 (6) is missing after Kkh 267,11.

⁵ Pāc-y 138,6: **aṅgulantarāni** ti (Sp IV 895,17) *pādaṅgulavivaram*. “**aṅgulantara-**
rāni means: the space between the toes (literally: the fingers of the feet).”

⁶ *chatta-dandaka*. In *upāhana-dandaka*, °*dandaka* is understood as the peg coming between the big toe and the second toe (see CPD s.v. *upāhana-dandaka*). Cone, however, assumes it to mean “a sandal-stick (for carrying them?)” (DOP s.v. *upāhanā*). The latter meaning of *dandaka* is supported by an enumeration of requisites in which *chatta-dandaka* and *chatta-danda* are used alternatively (Sp VI 1242,26f. = Kkh 235,25f. *chatta-dando* ≠ Pālim 306,30f. *chatta-danḍako*). This list enumerates a number of sticks (*kattara-yatṭhi*, *upāhana-danḍako*, *chatta-danḍ[ak]a*, *chatta-sālakā*, see above, p. 472). But neither this meaning of *chatta-dandaka* nor that of *chatta-danda* as an umbrella handle is convincing in the present context. It seems more probable that it refers to some loops on the footwear for the toes.

⁷ Sp IV 895,17f.: **akkantassā** ti (Vin IV 201,17) *chattadandake aṅgulantaram*
appavesetvā kevalam pādukam akkamityā thitassa. “**To one mounted on**

538

Bhikkhupātimokha: I. Rules of Training

⟨268⟩

or (2) to one [with footwear] fastened by virtue of standing having inserted [the toe interspace into the grass (?) peg].

In the sixth [rule] also this is exactly the manner.

But here whoever is called “one [with footwear unfastened]” by virtue of standing ^a—having released the heel strap,^a even for him it is not suitable [to teach the Doctrine].¹ [152]

[63. The commentary on the rule about vehicles]

[63 (7). Sekh: *I shall not teach the Doctrine to one in a vehicle [who is] not ill; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 104,9f. = Vin IV 201,25f.)]

In the seventh [rule], ^b—even if one is seized by two people with interlocked hands; or having been placed on a cloth is carried along by a bamboo [pole]; or one is seated on an unyoked vehicle, such as a litter; or, having taken it apart, even on a mere wheel placed aside, one is counted as “one gone into a vehicle”.

But if two are seated in one vehicle, it is suitable. Even if they are seated apart it is suitable that the one seated in a high vehicle teaches [the Doctrine] to the one seated in a low [vehicle]. Even if [the vehicles] are of equal height ⟨268⟩ it is suitable. Similarly, [it is suitable] that one seated in front teaches [the Doctrine] to one seated behind. But it is not suitable that one seated behind even though higher up teaches [the Doctrine].^{-b}

[64 (8). The commentary on the rule about couches]

[64 (8). Sekh: *I shall not teach the Doctrine to one on a couch [who is] not ill; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 104,12f. = Vin IV 202,3f.)]

In the eighth [rule] ^c—*to one on a couch (sayanagatassa, Pāt 104,12)* means: it is not suitable that one standing or sitting on a high bed or seat or a place on the earth teaches [the Doctrine] to someone lying down on a grass mat or the common ground. But it is suitable that one on a couch

^a—^a ≠ Sp IV 895,20 ^b—^b ≠ Sp IV 895,21–29 ^c—^c ≠ Sp IV 895,29–86,1

means: to one who, not having put the toe interspace into the *chatta* peg, only stands having mounted the [non-leather] footwear.”

¹ Listed in Vin IV 201,17 (BD III 143).

⟨268⟩

Sekhiya 66 M

539

| who is lying down on a higher [couch] or [a couch of] equal height
| teaches [the Doctrine] to someone on a couch. It is suitable, however,¹
| that someone lying down teaches [the Doctrine] to someone standing or
| sitting or lying down,² and³ someone sitting down to someone standing
| or sitting, [and]⁴ someone standing, only to someone standing.^{-c}

| [65 (9). The commentary on the rule about sitting with [legs] enclosed]

| [65 (9). Sekh: *I shall not teach the Doctrine to one who sits with [legs]*
| *enclosed [who is] not ill; [this is] a training to be practised.*

| (Pāt 104,15f. = Vin IV 202,12f.)]

| In the ninth [rule]^d it is not suitable to teach [the Doctrine] to some-
| one sitting with one or other^{-d} of [the positions of the legs] enclosed by
| [the] hands, etc.⁵

| [66 (10). The commentary on the rule about wrapped]

| [66 (10). Sekh: *I shall not teach the Doctrine to one with [his] head*
| *wrapped [who is] not ill; [this is] a training to be practised.*

| (Pāt 104,18f. = Vin IV 202,22f.)]

| In the tenth [rule]^e to one with [his] head wrapped (*vethitasāsassa*,
| Pāt 104,18) means: [wrapped] with a cloth wrap or a turban, etc., so that
| the end of his hair (or: the hairline) is not seen,⁶ to one with [his] head
| wrapped thus.^{-e} That's why it is stated in the non-offence [clause] of
| this [rule], f—“[There is no offence if] he teaches [the Doctrine to one]
| after having caused [him] to uncover the end of [his] hair”^{-f}

d-d ≠ Sp IV 896,2f. e-e Sp IV 896,4f. f-f Vin IV 202,28f.

¹ Sp IV 895,33 reads *ca* for *pana*, which seems to fit the content better, since the preceding sentence was already introduced with *pana*. And the present sentence explains more details.

² Sp IV 895,33f. does not list the one lying down here, since he was mentioned already in the preceding sentence.

³ Sp IV 895,34 reads “even” (*api*) for “and” (*ca*).

⁴ Kkh 268,11, n. 10, gives *ca* as a variant of C^e. The construction of this sentence shows that something is needed here, be it the *ca* of Kkh C^e or the *vā* of Sp.

⁵ The others being the legs enclosed by some cloth or some bandage. For details, see above, p. 521, n. 1, and Appendix 45.

⁶ Unlike the following rule the present one refers to various types of headgear.

540

Bhikkhupātimokha: I. Rules of Training

⟨269⟩

[269] [67 (11). The commentary on the rule about covered]

[67 (11). Sekh: *I shall not teach the Doctrine to one with [his] head covered [who is] not ill; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 104,21f. = Vin IV 202,34f.)]

In the eleventh [rule] ^g-to one with his head covered (*ogunñthitatisassā*, Pāt 104,21) means: to one clothed including the head.^{1-g}But here there is an addition to the non-offence [clause: ^h—“There is no offence if] he teaches [the Doctrine to one] having had [him] uncover [his] head”^{—h} (= 7. non-offence).

[68 (12). The commentary on the rule about on the ground]

[68 (12). Sekh: *I shall not while sitting on the ground teach the Doctrine to one sitting on a seat [who is] not ill; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 104,24f. = Vin IV 203,11f.)]

In the twelfth [rule] ⁱ-while sitting on the ground (*chamāyam nisīditvā*, Pāt 104,24) means: while sitting on the earth.On a seat (*āsane*, Pāt 104,24) means: to one sitting having spread out at least a robe or grass.^{—i}

[69 (13). The commentary on the rule about low seats]

[69 (13). Sekh: *I shall not while sitting on a low seat teach the Doctrine to one sitting on a high seat [who is] not ill; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 106,2f. = Vin IV 203,22f.)]

In the thirteenth [rule] ^j-on a high seat (*ucce āsane*, Pāt 106,2) means: to one sitting in an elevated place, even if it is a place on the earth.^{—j}

[70 (14). The commentary on the rule about standing]

[70 (14). Sekh: *I shall not while standing teach the Doctrine to one sitting [who is] not ill; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 106,5f. = Vin IV 204,33f.)]

g-gSp IV 896,5f. h-hVin IV 203,5f. i-i≠ Sp IV 896,6ff. j-j≠ Sp IV 897,17

¹ Kkh 269,4, after *pāruttassa* an “—a” should be added. Kkh 269,5 the “—a” after “adhikam.” should be deleted.

Page 589 job: 1272818

⟨270⟩ *Sekhiya 72 M* 54I

In the fourteenth [rule ^k-*I shall*] *not while standing [teach the Doctrine] to one sitting (na thito nisinnassa, Pāt 106,5)* means: if a great elder (*mahāthera*) sitting on a seat asks a question of a young [bhikkhu] who stands [there], having gone to wait on the elder, [the young bhikkhu] must not speak (i.e. answer). But [since] out of respect it is not possible to say to the elder,¹ “Ask, after having stood up”, [therefore] it is suitable [for the young bhikkhu] to say “I shall speak to the bhikkhu (i.e. the elder) [when he is] standing to one side.”^{2-k} **⟨270⟩**

[71 (15). The commentary on the rule about going behind]

[71 (15). Sekh: *I shall not while going behind teach the Doctrine to one going ahead [who is] not ill; [this is] a training to be practised.* (Pāt 106,8f. = Vin IV 205,4f.)]

In the fifteenth [rule] ^a-if the one going ahead^a asks a question, [the one going behind], not answering his [question], ^b-should say, “I shall speak to the bhikkhu [if he is going] behind”. But it is suitable to rehearse the Doctrine learned together with [him] or to speak to one going side by side [with him].^{3-b}

[72 (16). The commentary on the rule about going beside a path]

[72 (16). Sekh: *I shall not while going off the path teach the Doctrine to one going on the path [who is] not ill; [this is] a training to be practised.* (Pāt 106,11f. = Vin IV 205,10f.)]

In the sixteenth [rule] ^c-*not [while going] off the path (na uppathera, Pāt 106,11)*: In this connection, if two go side by side on a cart road, either along the path for each wheel of a cart, or off the path, it is suitable.^{-c}

^{k-k}≠ Sp IV 897,18-22 ^{a-a}Sp IV 897,23 ^{b-b}≠ Sp IV 897,24-27
^{c-c}≠ Sp IV 897,27ff.

¹ Kkh 270,4 adds *tam* before *akathetvā* “not having answered this”.

² So it is obviously allowed that the standing young bhikkhu explains to the sitting bhikkhu the manner in which he will be able to answer the latter’s question (see also Vin-vn-t II 24,23f.). This then does not count as “teaching the Doctrine”.

³ The parallel in Sp is a little more detailed: “But it is suitable to rehearse the Doctrine learned together with [him]; it is suitable to speak to one going side by side [with him] (Sp IV 897,25ff.: *saddhim uggahitadhammam pana sajjhāyitum vattati. samadhurena gacchantassa kathetum vattati*).

542

Bhikkhupātimokha: I. Rules of Training

⟨271⟩

[73 (17). The commentary on the rule about defecating while standing up]

[73 (17). Sekh: *I shall not, [when] not ill, defecate or urinate while standing; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 106,14f. = Vin IV 205,16f.)]

In the seventeenth [rule] “unintentionally” (*asañcicca*, Vin IV 205,21) in the non-offence [clause]¹ means: ^d—if faeces or urine emerges suddenly while he is going to a concealed place, that is one who acted unintentionally.^{—d}

[74 (18). The commentary on the rule about defecating on green plants]

[74 (18). Sekh: *I shall not, [when] not ill, defecate or urinate or spit on green plants; [this is] a training to be practised.*

(Pāt 106,17f. = Vin IV 205,25f.)]

In the eighteenth [rule], ^e—whatever root of a living tree is visible going along on the earth ⟨271⟩ or [whatever] branch goes along attached to the earth, all that counts as green plants. But sitting on a tree trunk, it is suitable to make [one’s faeces] fall on a place with little green. If [faeces] suddenly emerge from him [while] just looking for a place with little green, he is in the state of an ill person.^{2—e} [I53]

The [following] is an addition to the non-offence [clause] in this connection: ^f—“[There is no offence] if having done [his business] where there is little green, he spreads green over [it].”^{3—f}

There, even if ^g—he⁴ does not find a [place] with little green, having made [his business somewhere] — except for [on] a roll of grass or a roll of straw⁵ — he afterwards spreads green over [it], it is suitable

^{d—d}Sp IV 897,29ff. ^{e—e}# Sp IV 898,1—5 ^{f—f}Vin IV 205,30f. ^{g—g}Sp V 898,5—8

¹ That is, in the Vinaya (Vin IV 205,21).

² Kkh 271,4 “—d” should be inserted after “hoti.”

³ Perhaps this sentence is added to the non-offence clause because the rule refers to green plants (*harita*), and in order to show that “little green” (*appa-harita*) does not count as “green”.

⁴ Kkh 271,5 a superscript “e—” should be inserted before *appaharitam*, and the superscript “—d” in Kkh 271,7 should be replaced by a superscript “—e”.

⁵ Kkh 271,6 *palalandupakam*; the variant *palāla*^o is noted in the footnotes only. *Palāla*^o should be put in the main text, *palala*^o of B^e in the notes.

⟨271⟩

Sekhiya 75 M

543

| indeed. And with spit (*kheṭa*), even mucus (*siṅghāṇikā*) is included here.^{1-g}

| [75 (19). The commentary on the rule about defecating in water]

| [75 (19). Sekh: *I shall not, [when] not ill, defecate or urinate or spit into water; [this is] a training to be practised.*

| (Pāṭ 106,20f. = Vin IV 206,22f.)]

| In the nineteenth [rule] this^h “not ... into water” (*na udake*, Pāṭ 106,20) is said with reference to water for enjoyment (*paribhoga-udakam*) only.

| But in bodies of water not for enjoyment, such as privies and the sea, etc., there is no offence (= 7. non-offence).

| If it is raining, [and] a flood of water has arisen all around,^h i—it is suitable that one who does not reach a place without water makes [it] (i.e. faeces, urine, or spit) in the water.ⁱ

| Here too, the [following] is an addition to the non-offence [clause]:
j—“[There is no offence, if] one who has done [it] on dry land pours water [on it].”^j The remainder in all rules is entirely clear.

| k—But in order to illuminate the origin (= 10. [*sorts of*] origin), etc., here, the [following] is miscellaneous [information]:

| Four [rules] connected with laughter (Sekh 11–12) and loud sound (Sekh 13–14), one [rule on] talking with the mouth full of food (Sekh 43), [and] five [rules] connected with sitting on the ground (Sekh 68), sitting on a low seat (Sekh 69), standing (Sekh 70), going behind (Sekh 71), [and] going off the path (Sekh 72) — these ten rules have the origin of the rule about admonishing (*samanubhāṣana-samuṭṭhāna*, Sgh 10 M);³

h-h ≠ Sp IV 898,9ff. i-i Sp IV 898,13f. j-j Vin 206,27f. k-k ≠ Sp IV 898,16–31

¹ At least this last sentence is marked as a quotation from the Mahāpaccarī in Sp IV 898,7f. But it cannot be excluded that the citation starts earlier still. The whole paragraph is largely identical in Sp and Kkh.

² As in the previous rule (Sekh 74), this addition is found in the non-offence clause in the Vinaya. Why this has been added is unclear since the rule only refers to an area with water. Cf. p. 527, n. 3; p. 531, n. 1; p. 534, n. 2.

³ Since the rule Sgh 10 M is the first rule to have this origin (a single origin, consisting in body, speech, and thought), that rule’s name is used as a keyword for this origin in all the later rules. In the case of this *samuṭṭhāna*, Sp also knows the alternative name *dhuranikkhepa*, never used as the rule’s name, and never used in Kkh (von Hinüber 1992a: 63f. [2009: 152f.]). The system is explained in detail by von Hinüber 1992a.

each one here [originates in] activity (11. *activity*),
 [has] acquittal due to [lacking] awareness (= 12. *awareness*),
 [is dependent on] intention (= 13. *intention*),
 [is] a fault according to common opinion (= 14. *fault*),
 [is] a physical deed, a verbal deed (= 15. *deed*),
 [is done with an] unwholesome thought (= 16. *thought*),
 [with an] unpleasant feeling (= 17. *feeling*). ⟨272⟩

The rule about asking for curry and gruel (Sekh 37) has the origin (= 10. [*sorts of*] *origin*), of the rule about a caravan of thieves (Pāc 66 M);¹

[it originates in] activity (= 11. *activity*),
 [has] acquittal due to [lacking] awareness (= 12. *awareness*),
 [is] a fault according to common opinion (= 14. *fault*),
 [is] a physical deed, a verbal deed (= 15. *deed*),
 [is done with an] unwholesome thought (= 16. *thought*),
 [with an] unpleasant feeling (= 17. *feeling*).

The eleven [rules] called “with an umbrella in [his] hand” (Sekh 57), “with a staff in [his] hand” (Sekh 58), “with a knife in [his] hand” (Sekh 59), “with a weapon in [his] hand” (Sekh 60), “[non-leather] footwear” (Sekh 61), “[leather] footwear” (Sekh 62), “vehicles” (Sekh 63), “couches” (Sekh 64), “sitting with [legs] enclosed” (Sekh 65), “wrapped” (Sekh 66), [and] “covered” (Sekh 67) have the origin of the rule about teaching the Doctrine² (= 10. [*sorts of*] *origin*);

¹ This has two origins, namely body and thought; and body, speech, and thought, von Hinüber 1992a: 60f.

² *dhamma-desana-samutthāna*; the thirteen *samutthānas* are normally named after the first Pātimokha rule where they appear. *Dhammadesana-sikkhāpada* is the title of Pāc 7 M (attested already in a cross reference in the Vajirabuddhi-ṭīkā, ca. tenth century C.E.; see Kieffer-Püllz 2013: II 1043), which is classified as having the same origin as the *padasodhamma* rule (Pāc 4 M). The *padasodhamma-samutthāna* offers two possibilities, namely origination from speech or from speech and thought. Thus, unlike in most other *samutthānas*, *dhamma-desana-samutthāna* cannot refer to the rule of the same name (Pāc 7 M) since it only offers one possibility of origination, namely from speech and thought (*vācācittato*, Sp IV 898,29f.). And as we learn from the present statement, it is valid for the eleven rules (Sekh 57 to 67; Sp IV 898,29f.), with which the section on rules connected with the teaching of the Doctrine

Page 593 job: 1272818

⟨272⟩ *Sekhiya 75 M* 545

[they originate in] activity and inactivity (= 11. *activity*),
 [have] acquittal because of [lacking] awareness (= 12. *awareness*),
 [are dependent on] intention (= 13. *intention*),
 [are] “faults according to common opinion” (= 14. *faults*),
 [are] verbal deeds (= 15. *deed*),
 [are done with an] unwholesome thought (= 16. *thought*),
 [with an] unpleasant feeling (= 17. *feeling*).^k

The remaining ^a-fifty-three [Sekhiya rules]^l have the divisions of origin
 (= 10. [*sorts of*] *origin*), etc., of the first [rule entailing] defeat^a (Pār 1 M).²

The commentary on the nineteen rules connected
 with teaching the Doctrine is finished.

The commentary on [the rules] of training of the Kaṅkhāvitaranī,
 the commentary on the Pātimokkha, is finished.

^a=^a≠ Sp IV 898,32

(*dhamma-desanāpaṭisamyutta*) begins. Therefore, it seems that *dhamma-desana-samutthāna* refers to Sekh 57, which would be the first rule with this *samutthāna* (so also von Hinüber 1992a: 61). Unlike most titles of the *samutthānas*, the *dhamma-desana-samutthāna* thus would neither have received its name from the rule of the same name (Pāc 7 M), nor from the rule where it occurred first (Sekh 57: *chatta-pāni-sikkhāpada*), but from a whole group of rules.

¹ That is Sekh 1–10, 15–36, 38–42, 44–56, and 73–75.

² Pār 1 M is classified as “a fault according to common opinion” (*lokavajja*, 14). Vmv considers this classification category valid for Sekh 36 and 38 (Vmv II 60,9ff.), but for the remaining 73 Sekhiyas prefers the classification as “a fault according to a precept [laid down by the Buddha]” (*panṇattivajja*), following the early Vinaya expert Phussadeva, contrary to Sp and Kkh, which follow the Vinaya expert Upatissa (see Kieffer-Püllz 2013: II 1523 and n. 34) and classify all 75 Sekhiyas as *lokavajja* (Kkh 271,21; 272,2, 6f., 8; Kieffer-Püllz 2013: II 1523).

Pār 1 M is further classified as *akusala-citta*. This is accepted by Vmv for Sekh 36 and 38, but for the remaining Sekhiyas Vmv again prefers the classification as connected “with three [types of] thought” (*ti-cittam*), following Phussadeva Thera, contrary to Sp and Kkh.

546 *Bhikkhupātimokha: J. Settlement of Legal Cases* ⟨273⟩

⟨273⟩ [J. The Commentary on the Settlement of Legal Cases]

[Now, venerable sirs, these seven rules for the settlement (samatha) of legal cases (*adhikaraṇa*)¹ come up for recitation:

For the settlement, for the stilling of whichever legal cases² arise

1. “a verdict in the presence of”³ (sammukhā-vinaya) may be given;
2. “a verdict of innocence”⁴ may be given (sati-vinaya);
3. “a verdict of [past] insanity”⁵ (amūlhabhinaya) may be given;
4. it is to be acted in accordance with the acknowledgement [of an offence] (paṭīññā);⁶
5. “a [decision] of the majority” (yebhuuyasikā) [may be made];⁷
6. “[a procedure for] one’s obstinate wrongness”⁸ (tassapāpiyasikā);

¹ For a discussion of the *adhikaraṇas* in the Pāli tradition, see Nolot 1996: 92–115; in a broader context they are dealt with by Stuart 2017: 225–67. A detailed study with focus on the Mūlasarvāstivāda is Borgland 2014. For still other translations of the terms of the seven settlements than those given below, see Nānātusita 2014: 328–32.

² *adhikaraṇa* is translated in various ways: “question, lawsuit” (CPD s.v.); “case; legal question” (DOP s.v.); “legal question” (IBH, BD III 153; Nolot 1996: 92ff.); “litigation” (MLDB 855ff.; Stuart 2017: 231); “issue” (Thānissaro 2007: I 546); “legal issue” (Nānātusita 2014: 328). Since what is meant are generally specific “legal cases”, we decided on this translation.

³ So IBH (BD III 153); “verdict involving the presence” (Nolot 1996: 99); “removal through the presence [of the bhikkhu]” (Nānātusita 2014: 328).

⁴ So IBH (BD III 153), Nolot 1996: 99; “a verdict of mindfulness” (Thānissaro 2007: I 547); “removal [of the accusation] through remembrance” (Nānātusita 2014: 328).

⁵ So IBH (BD III 153), Nolot 1996: 99, Thānissaro 2007: I 548; “the removal through [no longer being] insane” (Nānātusita 2014: 328); “procedure of regaining one’s wits” (Stuart 2017: 232).

⁶ *paṭīññāya kāretabbam*; for details see Appendix 47.

⁷ So BD III 153, Nolot 1996: 99; “acting in accordance with the majority” (Thānissaro 2007: I 548); a recent investigation of the majority vote on a broader scale is found in Stuart 2017: 225–67.

⁸ “Decision for specific depravity” (BD III 154); “verdict of obstinate wrongness” (Nolot 1996: 99); “acting for his further punishment” (Thānissaro 2007: I 549); “[the decision making it] worse for him” (Nānātusita 2014:

<273>

Adhikarāṇa

547

7. “the covering up [as] with grass”¹ (*tīṇavatthāraka*). (*Pāṭ 108,6–16*
 = *Vin IV 207,1–5*)]

In settlements of legal cases, *seven* (*satta*, *Pāṭ 108,6*) is the exact determination of their number.

Settlements of legal cases (adhikarāṇa-samathā, Pāṭ 108,6) means: they settle, put to rest, legal cases.

They come up for recitation (uddesam āgacchanti, Pāṭ 108,7) means: they come up to the state of being recited in order to ask about the state of purity² in respect of the offences (*āpatti*) called legal cases arising from offences (*āpattādhikarāṇa*) and in respect of [those] caused by the remaining three [types of] legal cases.³

Whichever arise (uppannuppannānam, Pāṭ 108,8) means: [of them] arising and arising (resolution of compound).

Of legal cases (adhikarāṇānam, Pāṭ 108,8) means: of the [following] four:

- (I) of legal cases from disputes (*vivāda*),
- (II) of legal cases from censure (*anuvāda*),
- (III) of legal cases from offences (*āpatti*),
- (IV) of legal cases from legal duties (*kicca*).

For the settlement, for the stilling (samathāya vūpasamāya, Pāṭ 108,8f.)

means: in order to settle, in order to still, the [following] seven settlements are to be given:

- (I) “a verdict in the presence of” (*sammukhāvinayo*) ...⁴
- (7) “the covering up [as] with grass” (*tīṇavatthāraka*).

b—There, this is the regulation:

b—bPs IV 42,23–46,22 = Sv III 1040,34–43,22

328); Nolot 1999: 93–100 (Appendix I) replaces Nolot’s description of the *tassa-pāpiyyasikā* in Nolot 1996: §2c (iv).

¹ So *BD III 153*; “covering up the dispute ‘as with grass’” (Nolot 1996: 99); “covering over as with grass” (Thānissaro 2007: I 551); “covering [the offences as if] with grass” (Ñāṇatissa 2014: 328).

² Of the members participating in the respective Pātimokha recitation.

³ That is “legal cases from controversies” (*vivādādhikarāṇa*), “legal cases from censure” (*anuvādādhikarāṇa*), and legal cases from legal duties (*kiccādhikarāṇa*).

⁴ For the remaining five, see above, p. 546.

548

Bhikkhupātimokha: J. Settlement of Legal Cases

⟨274⟩

(I) In respect of legal cases, firstly, whatever dispute [arises] among bhikkhus disputing about the eighteen causes: “[It is] Dhamma” or “[It is] not Dhamma”,¹ [etc.,] this is a legal case arising from disputes (*vivādādhikaraṇa*).

(II) Whatever censure — [i.e.] blame² and rebuke — [there is] among those censuring because of a failure of virtuous conduct (*sīla-vipatti*), a failure of good conduct (*ācāra-vipatti*), a failure of [right] view (*ditthi-vipatti*), or a failure of livelihood (*ājīva-vipatti*), that is called “a legal case from censure” (*anuvādādhikaraṇa*).

(III) Five [groups of offences] that have come down in the Mātikā³ and two in the Vibhaṅga,⁴ ⟨274⟩ that is, [in] all, seven groups of offences are called legal cases from offences (*āpattādhikaraṇa*). [154]

(IV) Whatever is the carrying out of the four procedures (*kamma**) of the Saṅgha, [that is] a procedure consisting in the [formal] consultation [of the chapter] (*apalokana-kamma**), etc.,⁵ this is called “a legal case arising from legal duties”⁶ (*kiccādhikaraṇa*).

(I) There, c—“a legal case arising from disputes” (*vivādādhikaraṇa*) ceases by two settlements, [namely]

(1) “a verdict in the presence of” (*sammukhā-vinaya*) and

c—c Vin II 93,24–26

¹ This is the beginning of the enumeration of the eighteen possibilities causing a dispute (Vin II 88,21, BD V 117).

² Sp-t II 354,6f.: *anuvādo ti upavadanā c' eva codanā ca. tattha upavadanā nāma akkoso.* “Censure means: blame and rebuke. There ‘blame’ means scolding.” Vmv I 291,23f. ... *tattha upavadanā nāma garahā, akkoso ca.* “There ‘blame’ means: reproach, and scolding.” Kkh-nṭ 445,25: *upavadanā ti* (Kkh 273,26) *akkoso, codanā ti* (Kkh 273,26) *amuyogo.* “Blame means: scolding. Rebuke means: inquiry.”

³ These are Pārājika, Saṅghādisesa, Nissaggiya, Pācittiya, and Pāṭidesanīya.

⁴ The two categories of offences which are not part of the Pātimokha (*mātikā*), but of the Vibhaṅga, are the *thullaccaya* (“a grave offence”) and *dubbhāsita* (“offence of wrong speech”) offences.

⁵ The other three are a (2) “procedure consisting in a motion” (*ñatti-kamma**), (3) a “procedure [with a decision as] the second [element] after [putting] the motion” (*ñatti-dutiyā-kamma**), and (4) a “procedure [with a decision as] the fourth [element] after [putting] the motion” (*ñatti-catutthā-kamma**).

⁶ *kicca* here stands for *kamma**, and refers to the legal procedures to be carried out.

⟨274⟩

Adhikarāya

549

(2) “[a decision of] the majority” (*yebhuuyyasikā*).^c

(I.1) [A legal case arising from disputes] ceases¹ just by “a verdict in the presence of” (*sammukhā-vinaya*), in that very *vihāra* in which it arose,² or on the road for those going to settle [it] elsewhere,³ [or] it is handed over⁴ to the Saṅgha [at the place] where one has gone to,⁵ or if it is impossible that the Saṅgha there settles [the legal case arising from disputes], it ceases [by] being decided by a committee (*ubbāhikā*)⁶ in that very place or by individuals⁷ agreed upon. But in a [legal case arising from disputes] thus ceasing whatever is the presence of the Saṅgha, the presence of the Dhamma, the presence of the discipline, [and] the presence of the individuals, this is called “a verdict in the presence of” (*sammukhā-vinaya*).

(I.2) And there “the presence of the Saṅgha” (*saṅgha-sammukhatā*) is being face to face with the enacting Saṅgha by virtue of the completeness (*sāmaggi*) of the Saṅgha; “the presence of the Dhamma” (*dhamma-sammukhatā*) is the existence of the subject matter which is to be settled; “the presence of the discipline” (*vinaya-sammukhatā*) is its cessation (*samanam*) — just so as it is to be settled; and “the presence of the individuals” (*puggala-sammukhatā*) is the two opponents in the case (*attha*) being face to face, he who disputes and he with whom he disputes. But in the case of a settlement by a committee, here, “the presence of the Saṅgha” (*saṅgha-sammukhatā*) is lacking; so, firstly, [a dispute] ceases just by “a verdict in the presence of”.

But if even in this manner [the legal case arising from disputes] does not cease, then the bhikkhus agreed upon for the committee hand back this [legal case] to the Saṅgha [saying] indeed, “We cannot settle [it]”.

¹ *sammamānam*, present participle in *māna* from *sammati* (Skt *śram*) “to be appeased, calmed; to cease” (PED s.v.). This participle is used only in this context here, and in the literally corresponding parallels (Ps IV 43,11; Sv III 1041,10; Mp IV 67,19ff. refers to Sv and Ps).

² See Vin II 93,28–94,6 (BD V 125f.).

³ See Vin II 94,8–14 (BD V 126); for the commentarial statement, see Appendix 48.

⁴ *niyyātitam*. For details, see Appendix 49.

⁵ Vin II 94,15–95,24 (BD V 126ff.).

⁶ Vin II 95,25–96,28 (BD V 128f.).

⁷ The variant of some individuals being agreed upon separate from a committee (*ubbāhikā*) is not listed as an additional option in the Vinaya.

550 *Bhikkhupātimokha: J. Settlement of Legal Cases* ⟨275⟩

Then the Saṅgha, having agreed upon a bhikkhu possessed of five qualities¹ as the distributor of voting tickets (*salāka-ggāhāpaka*), through him having [each bhikkhu] take a voting ticket by virtue of one or other among the three ways of having a voting ticket taken — secretly (*guṇhaka*), openly (*vivatṭaka*), whispering in the ear (*sakaṇṇajappaka*)² — a legal case [that] is settled in a gathered assembly [consisting of] a majority of speakers of the Dhamma³ in the manner speakers of the Dhamma say [it should be] settled by “a verdict in the presence of” and by “the decision of the majority”. There, “a verdict in the presence of” is of exactly the stated manner,⁴ but whatever is carrying out a majority procedure, this is called the decision of the majority. Thus ⟨275⟩ “a legal case arising from disputes” ceases by two settlements.

(II) d—“A legal case arising from censure” (*anuvādādhikarana*) ceases by four settlements,⁵ [namely]

- (1) by “a verdict in the presence of” (*sammukhāvinaya*), and
- (2) by “a verdict of innocence” (*sativinaya*), and
- (3) by “a verdict of past insanity” (*amūlha-vinaya*), and
- (4) by “a [procedure] for one’s obstinate wrongness” (*tassa-pāpiya-sikā*).^{6-d}

(II.1) [A legal case arising from censure] ceasing (*sammamānam*) just by “a verdict in the presence of” is settled (*vūpasammati*) being

^{d-d}Vin II 99,20–22

¹ The five qualities of a bhikkhu allowed to be installed as a distributor of voting tickets (*salāka-gāhāpāka*) and the method of his installment are given at Vin II 84,20–37 (BD V 111). Such a bhikkhu should not follow the wrong course through favouritism (*chanda-gati*), through hatred (*dosa-gati*), through stupidity (*moha-gati*), or through fear (*bhaya-gati*), and should know which voting stick counts as taken and which does not (*gahitāgahitañ*).

² Vin II 98,35–99,19 (BD V 133).

³ The fact that the speakers of Dhamma are in the majority must be mentioned here because this is crucial for the manner in which the distributor of voting tickets acts. If bhikkhus speaking *adhamma* were in the majority, the distribution of voting tickets would be against the law (*adhammika*, Vin II 85,4, BD V 111).

⁴ As explained below, p. 553.

⁵ Vin II 99,19ff. (BD V 133ff.).

⁶ Kkh 275,3: for *tassa pāpiyasikāya* read *tassapāpiyasikāya*.

⟨275⟩

Adhikarāya

551

I decided thus: both he who censures and he whom he censures, having heard their speech, if there is no offence both having apologised;¹ if [there] is [an offence, saying,] “This is the offence here.”² There, the characteristic of “a verdict in the presence of” is of the stated manner.³

(II.2) But when the Saṅgha gives “a verdict of innocence” by means of a procedure [with a decision as] the fourth [element] after [putting] the motion (*ñatti-catuttha-kamma**) to a bhikkhu whose taints are destroyed, who is accused of an unfounded failure of virtuous conduct (*sīlavipatti*), [and] asks for “a verdict of innocence”, then [the legal case arising from censure] is settled by “a verdict in the presence of” and by “a verdict of innocence”. But the verdict of innocence having been given,⁴ a renewed censure by whomever in respect of that individual is not valid.⁵

(II.3) When an insane bhikkhu, if misconduct that is not seemly for a recluse has come into being by virtue of [his] insanity, being rebuked by the bhikkhus [with the words,] “Does the venerable one remember⁶ [having committed] such an offence?”, [and] even if he says, “That was done by me when insane. I do not remember it”, being indeed rebuked again by the bhikkhus he asks for “a verdict of past insanity” in order not to be rebuked,⁷ [155] and the Saṅgha gives him “a verdict of past insanity” by means of a procedure [with a decision as] the fourth [element] after [putting] the motion (*ñatti-catuttha-kamma**), then [the legal case arising from censure] is settled by “a verdict in the presence of”, and by “a verdict of past insanity”. But the verdict of past insanity having been given, a renewed censure by whomever in respect of that individual is not valid.⁸

¹ Or “having apologised to both”? In the case of this translation it is unclear who apologises, since in a regular case the two monks could be the only ones present.

² This case is not mentioned in the Samathakkhandhaka in the explanation of the *anuvādādhikarāya*.

³ See below, p. 553.

⁴ For details of legally giving of the *sati-vinaya*, see Vin II 80,27–31 (BD V 105).

⁵ Vin II 99,20ff. (BD V 133).

⁶ Kkh 275,14 *saratā yasmā* has to be corrected to *saratāyasmā*.

⁷ For this case, see Vin II 100,26f. (BD V 135).

⁸ Vin II 100,14–101,5 (BD V 135f.).

(II.4) But when for an obstinately wrong¹ individual, being rebuked because of [an offence entailing] defeat (*pārājika*) or [an offence] bordering on [an offence entailing] defeat,² who evades one question with another one³ because of the abundance of [his] obstinacy, the Saṅgha, thinking, “If this one will be one with root not cut off (*acchinnamūlo*),⁴ having acted properly,⁵ he will obtain revocation (*osāraṇa*);⁶ if he is one with root cut off, there will be expulsion (*nāsanā*)⁷ for him”, [then the Saṅgha] performs a procedure for his obstinate wrongness⁸ by means of a procedure [with a decision as] the fourth [element] after [putting] the motion (*ñatti-catuttha-kamma**); then [the legal case arising from censure]

¹ *pāpiyassa puggalassa*; *pāpa* here not only refers to the offence, but also to the person’s obstinacy since the speech is of a person against which a “procedure for his obstinate wrongness” (*tassa-pāpiyyasika-kamma*) is carried out, and since this procedure is intended for a person who commits an offence and does not admit it on his own initiative but only when being formally interrogated and thereby convicted.

² Kkh-nt 449,1ff.: ***pārājikasāmantena vā ti*** (Kkh 275,21) *dukkatena vā thullaccayena vā. methunadhamme hi pārājikasāmantā nāma dukkaṭam hoti, adinnādānādīsu thullaccayaṇ.* “Or because of an [offence] bordering on [an offence entailing] defeat means: because of an offence of wrong doing or a grave offence. For in case of sexual intercourse (Pār 1 M) [an offence] bordering on [an offence] entailing defeat is an [offence of] wrong doing; in case of taking what is not given (Pār 2 M) it is a grave offence.” See above, p. 90 for cases concerning Pār 1 M, and p. 109 for Pār 2 M. Why only wrong doings are listed in combination with Pār 1 M and not others, and why *thullaccayas* with Pār 2, but not with Pār 1 M, remains unclear.

³ For a definition, see above, pp. 304f. (Pāc 12 M).

⁴ Kkh-nt 449,3f.: ***acchinnamūlo bhavissati ti*** (Kkh 275,23) *pārājikam anāpanno bhavissati, sīlavā bhavissati ti vuttam hoti.* “He will be one with root not cut off means: he will be one who has not committed [an offence entailing] defeat; [therewith] it is said, “He will be a virtuous one”.

⁵ That is, having observed the duties and restrictions over some time (Nolot 1996: 110, n. 60). The short explanation in Vin II 86,5–28 has to be filled out with the statements made in connection with the *tajjaniya-kamma* (Vin II 3,1–5,15).

⁶ Kkh-nt 448,5f.: ***osāraṇam labhissati ti*** (Kkh 275,23) *kammappaṭippassaddhim labhissati.* See also Nolot 1996: 110; 1999: 44, n. 15.

⁷ See Hüsker 1997b: 93–111; Nolot 1999: 58–69.

⁸ Kkh 275,25: for *tassa pāpiyasikam* read *tassa-pāpiyasikam*; Kkh 275,26 for *tassa pāpiyasikāya* read *tassa-pāpiyasikāya*.

⟨276⟩

Adhikarāṇa

553

is settled by “a verdict in the presence of”, and by “[a procedure] for one’s obstinate wrongness”. Thus, “a legal case arising from censure” ceases by four settlements.¹ ⟨276⟩

(III) e—“A legal case arising from offences” (*āpattādhikaraṇā*)² ceases by three settlements, [namely,]

- (1) “a verdict in the presence of” (*sammukhā-vinaya*), and
- (2) “acting in accordance with the acknowledged” (*paṭiññāta-karāṇa*), and
- (3) “the covering up [as] with grass” (*tiṇa-vatthāraka*).³

(III.1–2) There is no settlement of [a legal case arising from offences] by “the verdict in the presence of” (*sammukhā-vinaya*) alone. But when a bhikkhu confesses a light offence,⁴ either to a single bhikkhu or in the midst of a group (*gāṇa*) or a Saṅgha in the manner stated in the commentary on the [rules] entailing expiation with forfeiture,⁵ then “a legal case arising from offences” (*āpattādhikaraṇa*) is stilled by “a verdict in the presence of” (*sammukhā-vinaya*) and by “acting in accordance with the acknowledged” (*paṭiññāta-karāṇa*).⁵

There, in the case of “a verdict in the presence of” (*sammukhā-vinaya*), firstly, the state of presence of them — the one who confesses and he to whom he confesses — [is] “the state of the presence of the individuals” (*puggala-sammukhatā*). The remainder is exactly of the stated manner.⁶ At the time of confessing to an individual and to a group, the state of the presence of the Saṅgha is lacking.

But whatever acknowledgement (*paṭiññā*) [there is] here — “I, sir, have committed such-and-such an offence”, “Do you see it?”, and,

¹e—eVin II 102,11ff.

¹Vin II 101,5ff. (BD V 136f.).

²Vin II 102,11ff. (BD V 137ff.).

³That is, every offence except Pārājika and Saṅghādisesa.

⁴See above, p. 245, n. 1.

⁵Vin II 102,11ff. (BD V 137f.) for details; *paṭiññāta-karāṇa* means that a legal case arising from offences is settled by acting in correspondence with what has been acknowledged by the bhikkhu.

⁶See p. 549.

554 *Bhikkhupātimokha: J. Settlement of Legal Cases* ⟨276⟩

“Yes, I see it” — the acting according to this [acknowledgment],¹ “In future you should be restrained”, is called “the acting in accordance with the acknowledged” (*paṭiññāta-karaṇam*).

In the case of [an offence entailing] a formal meeting of the Saṅgha (*saṅghādisesa*) the asking for probation² (*parivāsa-yācanā*), etc.,³ [is] the acknowledgement (*paṭiññā*). Giving probation, etc., (*parivāśādinam dānam*) is called acting in accordance with the acknowledged (*paṭiññāta-karaṇam*).

(III.3) But quarrelsome bhikkhus, having emerged from two factions, having practised much misconduct not befitting for a recluse, when the feeling of shame arose again [in them], seeing a fault in charging each other with an offence, [namely,] “If we should charge each other with these offences, it might even be that that legal case would conduce to acrimony,⁴ to animosity”,⁵ when they perform the procedure of covering up [as] with grass, then the legal case arising from offences ceases by “a verdict in the presence of” and by “the covering up [as] with grass” (*tīna-vatthāraka*).

¹ Kkh 276,10f. reads *yā ... paṭiññā, tāya ... karaṇam*; Kkh E^e 1981 in accordance with Kkh C^e reads *yam ... paṭiññāya, karaṇam* (in Kkh E^e 2003 276, n. 5, says “E^e repeats: *paṭiññāya āyatīm amvareyyāsī* (sic; correct to *sam°*) *ti karaṇam*”. This obviously is a mistake in Kkh E^e 1981 155,22f. Actually, there are several parallels to the entire Kkh section in various commentaries on the Suttapiṭaka. Sv E^e III 1042,38–43,2 reads *yā ... paṭiññā, tāya paṭiññāya ... karaṇam*. Ps E^e III 45,24–46,1 reads *yā (v.l. yam) ... paṭiññātāya ... karaṇam* (read *yam* rather than *yā*), and Mp B^e IV 201 reads *yam ... paṭiññātāya ... karaṇam*. This shows that the reading of Kkh C^e *yam ... paṭiññātāya ... karaṇam* cannot be excluded for Kkh 276,10ff.

² For details, see above, pp. 175ff.

³ The “etc.” includes asking for the *mānatta** penance (see above, p. 179).

⁴ Kkh 276,18 *kakkhaṭatthāya* without variants, although C^e has °*lattāya*. But see the reading *kakkhaṭatthāya* in the parallel passage in Vin II 86,37. The explanation of the commentary by *kakkhaṭabhāvāya* (Sp VI 1193,21 = Kkh-nṭ 449,10f.) clearly shows that °*ttāya* is the correct reading.

⁵ Kkh 276,18 *vālattāya* with variant °*lattāya* in C^e, though C^e reads °*lattāya*. The parallel in the Vinaya also reads *vālattāya*. Here too the commentary shows that °*ttāya* is the correct reading.

For there, as many [bhikkhus] as have come within arm's reach distance (*hattha-pāsa*)*,¹ not having made an explanation of their [legal] opinion² thus: "That does not please me", even if they have fallen asleep, from all of them all offences rise (i.e. they are removed) — except for³ a gross offence⁴ and [an offence] connected with householders.⁵ Thus a legal case arising from offences ceases by three settlements.

(IV) f—"A legal case arising from legal duties" (*kiccādhikarana*) ceases by a single settlement, [namely,] only by "a verdict in the presence of."⁶ Thus, these four legal cases cease, [each] according to rule by [one of] these seven settlements. Therefore it is said,⁶

For the settlement, for the stilling of whichever legal cases arise

- (1.) "a verdict in the presence of" may be given; ... ⟨277⟩
- (7.) "the covering up [as] with grass."

(Pāt 108,6–16 = Vin IV 207,1–5 = Kkh 273,4–11)]

f–f Vin II 104,9f.

¹ This in general is one precondition for the physical participation in a legal procedure. In the case of the *tīṇa-vatthāraka* procedure, the possibility of sending one's consent (that is, mental participation) is not allowed. Only monks who are physically present during the procedure are freed from their offences. For details, see Kieffer-Pülz 2010: 209f.

² *dīṭṭhāvikammam karoti*; since agreement is expressed by silence, giving one's legal opinion during a legal procedure (*kamma**), that is, *dīṭṭhāvikammam karoti*, means that the bhikkhus giving their opinion disagree with the legal procedure (for details, see Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 152ff.). Such bhikkhus are explicitly excluded here because they would not be freed from their offences. Those not giving their opinion thus profit from the *tīṇa-vatthāraka* procedure and become freed from their offences (Vin II 88,6f., BD V 116).

³ For the general exclusion of these types of offences from the procedure of *tīṇa-vatthāraka*, see Vin II 87,13 (BD IV 115).

⁴ *thulla-vajja*; that is a Pārājika or Saṅghādisesa offence (Kkh-nṭ 449,11f.).

⁵ *gihippaṭisañyuttam*; Kkh-nṭ 449,12f. = Sp VI 1194,3ff.: *gihippaṭisañyuttan ti* (Kkh 276,23) *gihinam hīnena khumṣana-vambhana-dhammikappaṭissavesu āpannam āpattim*. "[An offence] connected with householders means: an offence committed among [the offences consisting in] insulting householders with something low, treating [them] with contempt [with something low, treating them] with want of proper deference." For a description of the respective cases, see Vin II 15,29ff. (BD V 22ff.).

⁶ That is, it is said at the beginning of the Adhikarana section, see above, pp. 546f.

556 *Bhikkhupātimokha: J. Settlement of Legal Cases* 〈277〉

This is the method of the regulation in this connection, but the detailed account has only come down in the Samathakkhandhaka.¹ The regulation too is stated in the Samantapāsādikā on it.^{2-b}

[Venerable sirs, recited are the seven matters for the settlement of legal cases.]³

There, I ask the venerable ones: I hope that you are pure [in this] ...

(Pāt 108,19-22 = Vin IV 207,7-10).

Venerable sirs, the introduction has been recited, ...

(Pāt 108,23-10,7 = Vin IV 207,11-16).

This much, having come down in the Blessed One's text (sutta, i.e. the Pātimokha), having been included in [his] text, comes up for recitation every half month. There, it is to be trained by absolutely all — being complete,⁴ in agreement, not disputing.

(Pāt 110,8-10 = Vin IV 207,16-19)].

There, I ask the venerable ones: I hope that you are pure [in this]? (tatth' āyasmante pucchāmi kacci 'ttha parisuddhā?, Pāt 108,19) means: [156] I ask, I hope that you are pure in respect of these seven settlements of legal cases, that there is nothing which needs to be settled by you through [these] settlements. Through this, the state of being pure from all offences is asked.

Venerable sirs, the introduction has been recited, (uddiṭṭham kho āyasmanto nidānam, Pāt 108,23), etc., is the concluding statement (nigamana-vacanam).

There, this much (ettakam, Pāt 110,8) means: this many rules.

Having come down in the text (suttāgatam, Pāt 110,8) means: having come down in the text, [that is,] the Pātimokha.

Having been included in the text (sutta-pariyāpannam, Pāt 110,8) means: contained just there.

¹ That is, Vin II 73,1-104,12 (chapter 4).

² That is, Sp VI 1191,16-1199,12.

³ In quoting the text from the Pātimokha this line has been omitted at Kkh 277,3.

Before *tatth' āyasmante pucchāmi* (Kkh 277,3) the following sentence should be inserted: *uddiṭṭhā kho āyasmanto satta adhikaraṇasamathā dhammā* (Pāt 108,17f. = Vin IV 207,6).

⁴ *samagga;* this means complete as a Saṅgha within a monastic boundary.

⟨277⟩

Adhikaranya

557

Comes up for recitation every half month (*anvaddhamāsam uddesam āgacchati*, Pāt 110,9) means: comes up to be recited every half month by virtue of the observance (*uposatha*).

By [all] being complete (*samaggehi*, Pāt 110,10) means: [by all being] complete by virtue of physical unity.

By [all] being in agreement (*sammodamānehi*, Pāt 110,10) means: [by all] agreeing well because of the being at one [with each other] by virtue of mental unity.

By [all] not disputing (*avivādamānehi*, Pāt 110,10) means: [by all] not disputing even by virtue of one or other among the eighteen subjects of dispute.¹

It is to be trained (*sikkhitabbam*, Pāt 110,10) means: the training (*sikkhā*) of higher conduct (*abhisīla*) is to be perfected by those not transgressing this and that rule. But whatever has not been stated from time to time, all of that is [to be understood], because of having been stated in various previous rules and because of [its] meaning being clear.

The commentary on the settlement of legal cases is finished.

The commentary on the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha of the Kañkhāvitaranī, the commentary on the Pātimokkha, is finished.

¹ The eighteen subjects are enumerated, for instance, in Vin II 204,11–27 (BD V 286f.).

Page 607 job: 1272818

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 (ad p. 2, n. 3)

There are two possibilities concerning the announcement of purity: (1) It could be the declaration of the bhikkhus own purity (so *BD* IV 132, n. 1) — this is also the understanding of Kkh 21,22–23 (above, p. 45), — or (2) the declaration of the purity of the bhikkhus absent (so *Pāt* 1966: 18). This activity belongs to the four preliminary duties (*pubbakicca*, Kkh 21,20, 22–23) preceding the *saṅghakamma* of reciting the Pātimokkha (see *Pāt* 2–3). In the continuation of the text the bhikkhus are asked to reveal their offence, if they have committed one, and remember it during the recitation of the Pātimokkha. This demand is repeated after each section of the Pātimokkha (*Pāt* [Pāt 10,13–16]; *Sgh* [Pāt 22,11–14]; *Aniy* [Pāt 25,2–5]; etc.), which indicates a procedure during which the bhikkhus could confess their possible offences. If the declaration of purity as a preliminary duty referred to the bhikkhus' own purity, asking whether a monk remembers an offence at the end of each group of rules may be done in case a monk remembers something he forgot to confess before the recitation. Nevertheless, the declaration of purity of absent bhikkhus in the beginning is also necessary, and this activity would also tally with the other preliminary duties (announcing the time, counting the bhikkhus, announcing the instruction of the bhikkhunīs).

APPENDIX 2 (ad p. 3, n. 2; p. 5 n. 4, 5)

Similar to *Pāt* 6,4, the sentence (*uddiṭṭham* *kho* *āyasmanto* *nidānam*, *Pāt* 6,4) is put before the phrase “Herein I asked the venerable ones ...” in *Sp* V 1057,13–18. Kkh-nṭ deals with the fact that this sentence is placed at the end of the introduction in Kkh (Kkh-nṭ 128,1–8: *yam pan’ ettha nidānuddesaparicchedam dassentena suṇātu me bhante samgho ... pe ... āvikatā hi ’ssa phāsu hotū ti* (*Pāt* 4,8–6,2) *idhāgatanidānapālīm dassetvā tadanatarañ uddesakāle vattabbaśāpi uddiṭṭham* *kho* *āyasmanto* *nidānan* *ti* (*Pāt* 6,4) *imassa pāthassa yojanam akatvā tathāyasmante pucchāmī ti* (*Pāt* 6,5–8) *ādinā anusāvanādikam eva yojetvā dassitam, tam pana aparipunñanidānapālidassana-pubbakanidānuddesaparicchedadassananattham, khuddakapeyyālavasena vā pākaṭattā tassa ayojanam katan ti veditabbam, uddesakāle pana yojetvā va vattabbam.* “But whatever text of the introduction transmitted here the one who is showing the section of the recitation of the introduction has shown in this context, [i.e.] ‘Reverend sir, let the saṅgha listen to me ... for, when revealed, it is good for him’, he has not connected [it] to the [following] text ‘Recited, venerable

559

sirs, is the introduction' — even though this ought to be said immediately thereafter at the time of the recitation. [But this text] is [rather] shown having connected [it instead] only to the announcement, etc., beginning with the [words] '**Herein I ask the venerable ones**'. [Thus] this [text] has to be understood as not having been connected to [the earlier cited phrase], either in order to show the earlier section of the recitation of the introduction by showing the incomplete text of the introduction, or because it is obvious due to the short formula. But at the time of the recitation, it has to be said, having connected [it] indeed." Sp-t, Vmv and Vin-vn-t explain that after the recitation of the text found at Pāt 4,8–6,8, the sentence *uddiṭṭham kho āyasmanto nidānaṃ* is repeated (clearly stated in Vin-vn-t) before the sentence handed down in Sp V 1057,18–19 (*sutā ... sikkhitabban ti*, "heard are ... it is to be trained") is recited (Sp-t III 276,14–20 = Vmv II 170,10–13: *evam etam dhārayāmī ti* (Sp V 1057,17–18; Pāt 6,8) "*sutā kho panāyasmantehī*" *ti* (Sp V 1057,18) *ettha "evam etam dhārayāmī"* *ti* (Sp V 1057,17–18; Pāt 6,8) *vatvā "uddiṭṭham kho āyasmanto nidānaṃ* (Sp V 1057,15; Pāt 6,4), *sutā kho panāyasmantehi cattāro pārājikā dhammā*" *ti* (Sp V 1057,18–19) (Vmv adds *ādinā*) *vattabbam̄ ten' eva* (Vmv om. t.e.) *Mātikāṭṭhakathāyam* (Vmv adds *pi*) "*tatthāyasmante pucchāmi 'kaccittha parisuddhā'*", *dutiyam pi pucchāmi ... pa ... tasmā tuṇhi, evam etam dhārayāmī ti* (Pāt 6,5–8) *vatvā 'uddiṭṭham kho āyasmanto nidānan' ti* (Pāt 6,4) *ādinā nayena avasese sutena sāvite uddiṭṭho hotī*" *ti* (Kkh 3,7–11) (Vmv om. *evam eva* for *tatthā*° ... *ti*) *vuttam*. ("Thus I record it", means: having said, "Thus I record it", in the [following] context, "heard by the venerable ones", it should be said, "Recited, venerable sirs, is the introduction; heard are the four rules entailing defeat by the venerable ones." That is why it is said in the Mātikāṭṭhakathā, "There I ask the venerable ones, 'Are you pure in this?' A second time I ask, ... [a third time I ask,] ... therefore they are silent. Thus I record it." Having said [this, the Pātimokkha] is [completely] recited, when in the manner "Recited, venerable sirs, is the introduction" the remainder is proclaimed by means of the [portion] heard.

Cf. Vin-vn-t II 186,25–87,6; Kkh-nṭ 128,12–14.

Appendices

561

APPENDIX 3 (ad p. 10, n. 1; p. 274, n. 2)

Season	Month	Dark pakkha new-moon day	Bright pakkha full-moon day
Summer (gimha)	Citta (March/April)	First pakkha 15th	Second pakkha 15th
	Vesākha (April/May)	Third pakkha 14th	Fourth pakkha 15th
	Jetṭha (May/June)	Fifth pakkha 15th	Sixth pakkha 15th
	Asālha (June/July)	Seventh pakkha 14th	Eighth pakkha 15th
Rainy Season (vassa)	Sāvana (July/August)	First pakkha 15th	Second pakkha 15th
	Poṭṭhapāda (August/September)	Third pakkha 14th	Fourth pakkha 15th
	Assayuja (September/October) Also paṭhamā-°, pubba-°, purima-kattika	Fifth pakkha 15th	Sixth pakkha 15th
	Kattika (October/November) Also pacchima-kattika	Seventh pakkha 14th	Eighth pakkha 15th
Winter (hemanta)	Māgasira (November/December)	First pakkha 15th	Second pakkha 15th
	Phussa (December/January)	Third pakkha 14th	Fourth pakkha 15th
	Māgha (January/February)	Fifth pakkha 15th	Sixth pakkha 15th
	Phagguna (February/March)	Seventh pakkha 14th	Eighth pakkha 15th

For a similar list in comparison with that of the Mūlasarvāstivādin, see Vogel 1997: 687.

APPENDIX 4 (ad p. 10, n. 2; p. 12, n. 1; p. 13, n. 4)

sāmaggṛ-uposatha(-divasa), and sāmaggṛ-pavāraṇā(-divasa). The term *sāmaggṛ-uposatha* is used in a list of three times three types of observance at Vin V 123,19–22 (BD VI 193) and as one of five purifications at Vin V 133,2ff. (BD VI 213). Vin I 136,7–8 (BD IV 180f.; with Sp V 1066,32–67,4) allows *saṅgha-sāmaggṛ* as an exception for carrying out the observance on a non-observance day. Vin I 357,21–38 (BD IV 510) gives details as to this *saṅgha-sāmaggṛ*. It is a ceremony carried out as a procedure [with a decision as] the second [element] after [putting] the motion (*ñatti-dutiya-kamma**) once two quarrelling factions of bhikkhus are reconciled, and it symbolises the unanimity of the Saṅgha. All bhikkhus have to assemble at one place, even the bhikkhus who are ill, and no one is allowed to give consent (*chanda*) in this case (instead of participating). After this procedure the observance is to be carried out and the Pātimokkhā should be recited. Thus *sāmaggṛ-uposatha* is the observance following the [*saṅgha*]*sāmaggikaraṇā* / *saṅgakkaraṇā*. This shows that *sāmaggṛ-uposatha* is short for **saṅghasāmaggṛ-uposatha*. Cf. Sp VII 1397,15–17: *uposathadivaso* (Vin V 220,21f.) *nāma thapetvā kattikamāsam avasesu ekādasasu māsesu bhinnassa saṅghassa sāmaggīdivaso ca yathāvuttacātuddasapannarasā ca.* “**Observance day** means: the day of the unanimity of a Saṅgha which was split [before], in the eleven months, except for the month of Kattika, and [the]

observance on] the fourteenth [day] and fifteenth [day] as described.” See also Hu-von Hinüber 1994: 26 (I 5.2), and 225.

The term *sāmaggī-pavāraṇā(-divasa)* is found in a list of three times three types of invitation that parallels the similar list of types of observance days mentioned in the preceding paragraph. The commentary on the Parivāra confirms that it can be carried out only in between the two full-moon days of the earlier and later Kattika (Sp VII 1397,24–32: *appavāraṇāya pavāreti ti appavāraṇādivase pavāreti*. “*pavāraṇādivaso*” nāma ekasmim Kattikamāse bhinnassa saṅghassa sāmaggīdivaso ca paccukaḍḍhitvā *thapitadivaso* ca dve ca punṇamāsiyo. evam catubbidham pi *pavāraṇādivasam thapetvā aññasmin divase pavārento appavāraṇāya pavāreti nāma. idhāpi appamattakassa vivādassa vūpasame sāmaggīpavāraṇām kātum na labhanti. karontehi appavāraṇāya pavāraṇā katā hoti.* **One invites on a non-invitation [day]** (Vin V 220,22): ‘Day of the invitation’ means the day of [the procedure of] unanimity of a Saṅgha split [before] in one month of Kattika, and the day determined after one has postponed [the invitation ceremony] and the two full-moon [days] (i.e. in the months of Assayuja and Kattika). One who invites on another day, except for one of the four types of days of invitation, means **one invites on a non-invitation [day]**. Here too, in settling an insignificant dissension they do not obtain permission to carry out the invitation [ceremony] of unanimity. By those who carry [it] out, the invitation [ceremony] has been carried out on a non-invitation [day]”).

APPENDIX 5 (ad p. 12, n. 4)

According to Kkh-nt *abbhantara* in *kattikamāsabbhantare* means an interval of time within which *sāmaggi-pavāraṇā* can be carried out. Kkh-nt 135,19–22: *Kattikamāsabbhantare ti* (Kkh 5,21) ettha “*Kattikamāso*” nāma *pubbakattikamāsassa kālapakkhapātipadato paṭṭhāya yāva aparakkātikapunṇamā, tāva ekūnatiṃsa-rattidivo; tassabbhantare. tato pacchā vā pana pure vā na vaṭṭati.* “**Here, in the interval [between] the [full-moon days of the two] Kattika months**, ‘month of Kattika’ means from the first day of the dark fortnight of the earlier Kattika month (= Assayuja) up to the full-moon of the later Kattika (= Kattika); [an interval] so long [corresponds] to twenty-nine days and nights; in that interval. But later or earlier than that, it is not suitable.” A similar explanation is given at Vin-vn-ṭ II 209,16–19. Hence it follows that *abbhantara* refers to the interval between the full-moon day of the month of Assayuja (regular *pavāraṇā* day for those who kept the earlier rains retreat) and the full-moon day of the month of Kattika (the last opportunity for the regular *pavāraṇā* for those who kept the earlier and the later rains retreat).

Appendices

563

APPENDIX 6 (ad p. 16, n. 6)

A heap of pure dirt (*suddha-paṇsu-pabbata*) as well as of pure stone, or a heap mixed of both, is suitable as a marker (Kkh 8,19–20; Sp 1036,11–13); a heap of sand (*vālika-rāsi*), however, is forbidden (Sp 1036,13). It seems that here, Kkh takes *paṇsu-* and *vālika-rāsi* as belonging to the same forbidden category against Kkh 8,19f., above, p. 19. Kkh-nṭ does not comment on the content, but only on a grammatical point, cf. Kkh-nṭ 136,26–29. See, however, Pālim-nṭ I 368,20ff. (*aparāpi khaṇḍanimittā nāma yā animittupagapāsāṇam vā bahisārarukkham vā khāṇukam vā vālukapuñjam vā antarā ekam nimittam katvā sammatā*. “Further [boundaries] with insufficient markers” means: those other [boundaries] which are agreed upon, after a stone which is not suitable as a marker, or a tree whose best part is outside, or a stump, or a heap of sand has been made a marker”), where in a description very close to Kkh only *vālukapuñjam* is mentioned, whereas *paṇsu-puñja* is omitted, though in the text commented upon, nearly the same sentence is to be found as in Kkh 7,10–13 (Pālim 179,6–7: v.l. in comparison to Kkh is: *paṇsupuñjam vā vālukapuñjam vā aññataram*).

APPENDIX 7 (ad p. 16, n. 7)

For the translation of *antarā* in the sense of “[a marker (*ekam nimittam*)] in between [other markers which consist of objects that are suitable as markers]”, see Kkh-nṭ 136,29–37,6: ***antarā*** (Kkh 7,12) *nimittupaganimittānam antarā*. ettha ca yā tīhi nimittehi bajjhamaṇā animittupagesu tacasaṇarukkhādīsu aññataram antarā ekam nimittam katvā sammatā, sā khaṇḍanimittā nāma hoti. yā pana catupañcanimittādīhi bajjhamaṇā imesu tacasaṇarukkhādīsu aññataram antarā ekam nimittam katvā sammatā. sā khaṇḍanimittā nāma na hoti ti viññāyati nimittupagānām nimittānam tiṇṇam sabbhāvato. Atṭhakathāsu pana avisesena vuttam. tasmā upaparikkkhitvā gahetabbam. **In between** means: In between markers suitable as markers. And here, that [boundary] which is determined with three markers [and which] is agreed upon after one among the [objects] not suitable as markers — such as a tree whose best part is in the bark, etc. — has been made one marker in between (the other two markers, which are of the category suitable as markers), is called [a boundary with] insufficient markers. That [boundary] which, however, is determined with four, five markers, etc., [and] which is agreed upon — after one among these, such as a tree whose best part is in the bark, etc., has been made one marker in between (the other three, four, etc.) — is understood as [a boundary] which does not have insufficient markers, because three markers (of those which have been announced) are suitable as markers. In the commentaries however, [this] (i.e. *khaṇḍa-nimittā*) is

said without distinction. Therefore, it should be accepted after one has inquired into it.”

APPENDIX 8 (ad p. 19, n. 6)

The commentaries explain *sūci-dandaka* as follows: Kkh-pt 5.8f. *sūcidanda-kappamāṇo* (Kkh 8,10) *kaniṭṭhaṅguliparimāṇamatto*. “[A tree] of the size of a needle-stick means: one having the mere extent of the little finger”; Kkh-nṭ 140,12ff. = Sp-t III 270,9f.: *sūcidanḍakappamāṇo* *ti* (= Kkh 8,10) *sīhañadīpe* “*lekhanañdañdappamāṇo*” *ti vadanti*, so *ca kaniṭṭhaṅguliparimāṇo* *ti daṭṭhabbo* (Sp-t *daṭṭhabbañ*). “[A tree] of the size of a needle-stick means: on the Sīhañā island they say that [it is a tree] having the size of a writing stick, and this is to be regarded as having the extent of the little finger.” Vmv II 142,12–15 = Pālim-nṭ I 301,23–27: *sūcidanḍakappamāṇo* *ti* (Sp V 1037,29 = Pālim-nṭ I 301,23–27) *vamsa-danḍappamāṇo*. “*lekhanañdañdappamāṇo*” *ti keci. Mātikāñṭhakathāyam pana Avebhāṅgiyavinicchaye* “yo koci atṭhaṅgulasūciñdañdakamatto pi velu ... pe ... garubhañḍan” *ti* (Kkh 235,22f.) *vuttatā tanutara veļudanḍo* *ti ca sūciñdañdo* *ti ca gahetabbañ*. “[A tree] of the seize of a needle-stick means: [a tree] of the size of a bamboo-stick. Some [say]: ‘of the size of a writing-stick’. But because it is taught in the Mātikāñṭhakathā in the regulation of that which is not to be divided: ‘whatever bamboo, even one having the measure of a needle-stick eight fingers [in length], ... [is] heavy goods’, a thinner one is to be accepted as bamboo stick as well as a needle-stick.” Cf. Pāc-y 283,2ff.; Vin-vn-t II 309,8f.

APPENDIX 9 (ad p. 33, n. 2; p. 35, n. 2)

Examples given for *pārisuddhi-uposatha* show that it serves as a substitute for the *pavāraṇā* (see for this Sp V 1076,5–77,2 = Pālim 204,23–205,18):

(1) If in one rains residence (*vassāvāsa*) five bhikkhus have kept the earlier rains, and five, four, three, two, or one bhikkhu have kept the later rains, then the bhikkhus who kept the earlier rains carry out a regular *pavāraṇā*, but the bhikkhus who are still keeping the later rains, carry out *pārisuddhi-uposatha* in their presence, because no two motions are to be put in one observance house.

(2) The same is valid if the bhikkhus who keep the earlier rains are only four or three, and if the bhikkhus who keep the later rains are four, three, two, or one in the first case or three or two in the second case. The only difference with respect to the example mentioned before the first example is that here in both cases the bhikkhus who keep the later rains retreat fill the quorum for those who keep the earlier rains in carrying out the motion (*ñatti*) necessary for *saṅghapavāraṇā*.

(3) If the bhikkhus who keep the earlier rains retreat are only three and there is only one bhikkhu keeping the later rains retreat, then a *pavāraṇā* by a Saṅgha

Appendices

565

is not possible (since at least five bhikkhus are necessary). Therefore, the bhikkhu who keeps the later rains retreat fills the quorum for the “motion by a group” (*gana-ñatti*). Thereafter the bhikkhus of the earlier rains retreat perform *pavāraṇā*, and the bhikkhu of the later rains retreat performs *pārisuddhi-uposatha* in their presence.

(4) The same is valid if there are two bhikkhus of the earlier rains retreat, and if there are two bhikkhus or one bhikkhu of the later rains. If only one bhikkhu of each rains retreat is present, then one bhikkhu performs *pavāraṇā* before the other bhikkhu, and the other bhikkhu performs *pārisuddhi-uposatha*.

(5) If those who keep the later rains retreat are one more in number than those who keep the earlier rains retreat, first the *Pātimokha* is to be recited, then those who are in the minority carry out *pavāraṇā* in the presence of the majority.

(6) But if it is the *pavāraṇā* on the full-moon day (*cātur-masīnī*) of the month of Kattika (the regular date for the *pavāraṇā* of those who kept the later rains retreat), and those who entered the rains retreat later are more in number than those who kept the earlier rains retreat and who had already performed the *pavāraṇā* in the month of Assyuja (only this *pavāraṇā* is called the great Invitation), or they are of equal number, *pavāraṇā* is to be carried out by those who kept the latter rains after the motion for *pavāraṇā* has been put. Thereafter the Invitation is considered performed by those who kept the latter rains; the others, that is, those who kept the earlier rains, then carry out *pārisuddhi-uposatha* in their presence. But if those who carried out the great Invitation (i.e. those who kept the earlier rains) are more in number, then after the *pātimokha* has been recited, the fewer in number carry out *pavāraṇā* in the presence of the earlier ones.

APPENDIX 10 (ad p. 33, n. 5)

purimikāya upagatena vā. These words are missing in the parallel in Pālim 200,14f. The explanation in Kkh-pt shows that these words also were missing in the text of Kkh it is commenting on. Otherwise, the explanation of Kkh-pt about what a *vuṭṭha-vassa* is (it includes the *purimikāya upagatena*), and why he is not named in this place in Kkh, would not make sense. For, the *purimikāya upagatena*, if he was named in the text, would make the statement concerning the *vuṭṭha-vassa* superfluous (Kkh-pt 7.4-7: “*cātumāsiniyam pana pavāritānam santike anupagatena vā chinnavassena vā vuṭṭhavassena vā*” *ti avatvā anupagatena vā chinnavassena vā ti* (Kkh 15.22) *ettakam eva vuttam. vuṭṭha-vasso pana tasmiṁ kāle anupagatattā “anupagato” ti saṅkhyam gato ti.* “Not having said ‘in the presence of [those], who have been invited on the *cātumāsini*, however, [the observance by announcing purity has to be carried out] by

one who has not kept [the rains retreat] or has interrupted the rains [retreat] or has finished [keeping] the rains [retreat; instead] only so much has been said, by one who has not kept [the rains retreat] or has interrupted the rains [retreat]. One who finished [keeping] the rains [retreat], however, is called ‘one who has not kept [the rains retreat]’, because [he] does not keep [the rains retreat] in that period of time”.

The Kkh-pṭ commentary, however, shows that tradition thought that the *purimikāya upagatena* was also entitled to carry out *pārisuddhi-uposatha* in the presence of those who invited on the *cātur-māsinī*. Sp (1076,26–31 = Pālim 205,13–16) also gives an example for this: if it is the full-moon day of the month of Kattika, and the bhikkhus who kept the earlier rains retreat and had carried out *pavāraṇā* on the full-moon day of the month of Assaya are of an equal number to or a lesser number than the bhikkhus who kept the later rains, then the bhikkhus who kept the later rains put the motion and carry out *pavāraṇā*, and thereafter the bhikkhus who kept the earlier rains retreat carry out *pārisuddhi-uposatha* in their presence (see also above, Appendix 9).

APPENDIX 11 (ad p. 36, n. 5)

According to Vin I 125,16 (BD IV 166) sweeping the place for the observance can refer to an assembly hall (*upatṭhāna-sāla*), a pavilion (*maṇḍapa*), or the foot of a tree (*rukka-mūla*). An observance house (*uposathāgāra*) has to be agreed upon as a regular place for the observance, and as such the five usual lodgings (*vihāra, adhāyoga, pāsāda, hammiya, guhā*; Vin I 107,5–8; BD IV 139) or even the terrace in front of an observance house (*uposatha-pamukha*) was allowed (Vin I 108,6–19; BD IV 140f.). Since, however, the Pātimokha is valid if heard, whether sitting on ground agreed upon or not (Vin I 107,33–108,6; BD IV 140), any place should be possible. Accordingly, the duty to sweep the place can refer to any such place.

APPENDIX 12 (ad p. 63, n. 5)

Kkh 31, n. 3: C^E reads *upasampadāpekkhā*, which indicates more than one, i.e., at least two bhikkhus. This is possible, too, but would not be the standard formula. See Vin I 93,6f.: *anujānāmi bhikkhave dve ekānussāvane kātun ti*. “I allow, O bhikkhus, to perform for two [candidates of ordination] common proclamations (or: to perform [the ordination] for two [candidates of ordination] in one proclamation.” IBH (BD IV 119, “I allow you, bhikkhus, to make two proclamations together”) takes *ekānussāvane* as an accusative plural, and relates *dve* to *ekānussāvane*, which is not possible as the next rule shows (*dve tayo ekānussāvane kātum*; Vin I 93,12). There *tayo* can be a masculine plural nominative or an accusative, *anussāvana*, however, can only be neuter. Rhys Davids/

Appendices

567

Oldenberg chose the second translation (*VinTexts* I 228: “I allow you, O Bhikkhus, to ordain two persons by one proclamation”). Cf. Kieffer-Pülz 2013: III [Z301] [1].

APPENDIX 13 (ad p. 66, n. 5; p. 84, n. 1)

paññatti-vajja. A more elaborate version of this sentence (Kkh 31,29f.), which clearly shows its sense, is to be found in Sp-ṭ II 57,15f. = Kkh-nṭ 167,18f. [quoted from Sp-ṭ]: *paññattivajjesu pana sikkhāpadesu aññe pi ehibhikkhūpasaṃpadāya upasampannādayo saṅgahām gacchanti*. “But in the [Pātimokkha rules classified as], ‘fault[s] according to a precept [laid down by the Buddha]’, even others ordained by the ‘come monk’ ordination, etc., are included” All the rules of the Pātimokkha (Sp I 228,1ff.) — or the offences against the rules (Kkh 38,8ff., above, p. 85) — are classified as *loka-vajja* (“faults according to common opinion”) or *paññatti-vajja* (“faults according to a precept [laid down by the Buddha]”) (Sp I 228,1ff.: *duvidham hi sikkhāpadaṁ: lokavajjam paññattivajjañ ca. tattha yassa sacittakapakkhe cittam akusalam eva hoti tam lokavajjam nāma, sesam paññattivajjam*. “For a [Pātimokkha] rule is twofold: ‘a fault according to common opinion’ and ‘a fault according to a precept [laid down by the Buddha]’. There, for whatever [offence against a Pātimokkha rule] the thought is exclusively unwholesome, in case of [it being violated] intentionally, this [type of Pātimokkha rule is] called ‘a fault according to common opinion’; the rest [of the Pātimokkha rules are called] ‘fault[s] according to a precept [laid down by the Buddha].’” (Though rule is used throughout in the text, what is meant are the offences against the rules). In the translation by Juo-hsüeh (2000: 62, n. 72) *sacittakapakkhe* (“in case of [the rule being violated] intentionally”), is misunderstood as “intentional-type rule”. Accordingly, this statement is referred solely to rules involving intention (*sacittaka sikkhāpada*), though it is also valid for rules that do not involve intention (*acittaka sikkhāpada*). For further comments, see Sp-ṭ II 57,15ff. Cf. Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I [Z 15] [1].

APPENDIX 14 (ad p. 68, n. 1; p. 71, n. 3)

Speaking in haste, i.e., inconsiderately, or “in jest” (*davā*). Compare Vin III 28,2f. *davāya sikkham paccakkhāti*, “if he disavows the training for a joke” (BD I 47). But the whole commentarial tradition on the present passage explains *davāya* by *sahasā*, “hastily”. Sp I 25,31f.: *davāya ti* (Vin III 28,2) *sahasā aññam bhanitukāmo sahasā* “Buddham paccakkhāmī” *ti bhaṇati*. “**Davāya** means: One, who wishes to say something in haste, hastily says, ‘I renounce the Buddha.’” So also Vjb 199,21; Sp-ṭ II 81,7; Vmv I 254,7 ad Vin III 28,2; Kkh-nṭ 179,1f. ad Kkh 32,12. Cf. Vin IV 4,22f. [Pāc 2 M] where a definition of *davā bhaṇati* is contained in the *anāpatti* formula (*anāpatti davā bhaṇati ... davā bhaṇati nāma sahasā bhaṇati*)

which tallies with Sp IV 737,17ff. (*sahasā bhaṇatī ti* (Vin IV 4,23) *avīmaṃsītvā anupadhbāretvā vā vegena ... bhaṇati*). This shows that *dava* is used in the sense of hastily with the connotation “inconsiderately” in this place, at least according to the traditional interpretation. Nevertheless Kkh-nṭ explains *davāya* in the same context as “play”, Kkh-nṭ 182,19: *davāya pī ti* (Kkh 34,4) *kīlādhippāyena pi*.

APPENDIX 15 (ad p. 68, n. 2)

Stumbling speech (*rava*). Traditionally *rava* is understood as a synonym of *dava* in the sense of fun, wantonness, etc., by the translators, i.e. Vin III 28,3 *ravāya sikkham paccakkhāti*, “if he disavows the training for fun” (BD I 47); von Hinüber 1968: § 196 “Übermut”. Sp explains *ravāya* as “stumbling speech” (Sp I 255,32–56,4: *ravāyā ti* (Vin III 28,3) *ravābhāññena*, “*aññam bhaṇissāmī*” *ti aññam bhaṇanto*. “*purimena ko viseso*” *ti ce? purimam paṇḍitassāpi saha-sāvasena aññabhananām. idam pana mandattā momūhattā apakataññuttā pakkhalantassa “aññam bhaṇissāmī” ti aññabhananām.* **Ravāya** means: with hasty [or stumbling (?)] speech; [thinking.] ‘I will speak this’, one says something else. If [one asks, ‘What] is the difference with the former (i.e. with *davāya*)?’ [It should be said,] ‘The former is saying something else by virtue of haste even by one who is learned. But this (i.e. *ravāya*) is saying something else, [thinking], ‘I will speak this’, by one who stumbles by virtue of stupidity, silliness, or ignorance of the main point.’”) Similar explanations are given at Vjb 99,22f, Sp-t II 81,7–12, Kkh-nṭ 179,3f, and Vmv I 245,7f. Compare also Vin IV 4,22ff. [Pāc 1 M] (*anāpatti ... ravā bhaṇati ... ravā bhanati nāma aññam bhaṇissāmī ti aññam bhaṇati*) which according to Sp IV 737,19f. means to stumble and say, for example, *cīram* instead of *cīvaram*.

APPENDIX 16 (ad p. 83, n. 2)

nosaññā-vimokkha. In that case there is no acquittal, whether awareness is present or not. Points 12.1–2 represent the definition of the terms *saññā-vimokkha*/*nosaññā-vimokkha* with respect to all the Pātimokkha rules, i.e., the intentional type (*sacittaka*) as well as the unintentional type of rules (*acittaka*). In that connection it is a question of whether awareness plays a role or not that is most important, not whether awareness has to be present or lacking. Compare also the definition in Sp I 270,27ff.: *tatrāpi atthi saññāvimokkham, atthi nosaññā-vimokkham. tattha yam cittaṅganī labhati yeva, tam saññāvimokkham; itaram nosaññāvimokkham.* “There, too [Pātimokkha rules] are [classified as] having acquittal because of awareness [or] not having acquittal because of awareness. Therein only those [rules] which have intention as a factor [are classified as] having acquittal because of awareness (namely in case of lacking awareness);

Appendices

569

the other [rules are classified as] not having acquittal because of awareness.” In the above passage of Kkh, reformulated as a verse in Buddhadatta’s Uttaravinicchaya, the fact that only lacking awareness leads to acquittal, namely in case of intentional type rules, is clearly formulated (Utt-vn v. 861 *vītikkamana-saññāya abhāvena yato pana, vimuccati ayam saññāvimekkhā ti pakāsiṭā*. “That [offence], from which, however, one is acquitted because of the absence of awareness of a transgression is classified as ‘[having] acquittal due to [lacking] awareness’”). Cf. Utt-vn-t, vv. 861–62, Kkh-nṭ 194.^{25f}

The difficulty with the translation of *saññā* in *saññā-vimokkha/nosaññā-vimokkha* is that in the definitions which apply to all types of Pātimokkha rules (intentional and unintentional) it has to be understood simply as ‘awareness’, because here it is ruled that awareness plays a role with intentional type rules, but is ineffective in case of unintentional type rules. Contrary to that, *saññā* has to be translated as ‘lacking awareness’ if it refers exclusively to intentional type rules (*sacittaka sikkhāpada*). Without intention there is no transgression of an intentional type rule, thus awareness (*saññā*) of one’s transgression of such a rule leads to guilt, but lacking awareness to acquittal. Thus, *saññā-vimokkha* as a classification category, only possible with intentional type rules, has to be understood as “[having] acquittal because of [lacking] awareness”. For a detailed discussion of these terms, and their relation to the classification categories *sacittaka/acittaka*, see Kieffer-Püllz 2013: I [Z 25]. The earliest hint at this category of classification is Vin V 116,4 (BD VI 175) or Mil 159,2–5 (cf. MQ I, xlviif), depending on the exact dating of both texts.

APPENDIX 17 (ad p. 88, n. 5)

cammakhīla; Sp-t II 83,19ff.: ***cammakhīlan*** ti (Sp I 257,31) *nimitte utṭhitam cammam eva*. “*uṇṇigāndo*” ti pi vadanti. *nimitte jātam pi cammakhīlādi nimittam evā ti āha āpatti pārājikassā ti*. “A skin tag means: only skin grown on the sexual organ. [A skin tag] also [is] a [kind of] boil’ they say. Even grown on the sexual organ [that] skin tag, etc., is the sexual organ itself. [In that connection the author of Sp] says **it is an offence entailing defeat**.” Kkh-nṭ 191,10–11: ***cammakhīlan*** ti (Kkh 39,18) *cammakkhāṇḍham*. “*uṇṇigāndo*” ti pi vadanti. *tañ hi nimitte jātattā nimittam eva*. “A skin tag means: a piece of skin. ... “ Vmv I 139,10f.: ***cammakhīlan*** ti (Sp I 257,31) *elakādīnam gīvāya viya nimitte jātam cammaṅkuram*. “*uṇṇigāndo*” ti pi vadanti. “A skin tag means: a growth of skin growing on the sexual organ as on the throat of goats, etc., ... the rest as in Sp-t.”

According to all the commentaries, *cammakhīla* consists of skin; Vmv compares it to the *cammaṅkura* growing at the neck of goats. These are in German the “Glöckchen, Berlocken” (appendices colli).

APPENDIX 18 (ad p. 110, n. 1)

Lahu-bhaṇḍa are goods to be divided among the Sangha present. *Garu-bhaṇḍa* or *garu-parikkhāra*, however, must not be given away or transferred and are indivisible (*avissajjika*, *avebhāṇigika*). They belong to the Saṅgha of the four directions of the past and future. Five categories of *garu-bhaṇḍa* not to be transferred (*avissajjiyāni*) are listed in the Cullavagga (Vin II 170,23–35): (1) ārāma, ārāma-vatthu, (2) vihāra, vihāra-vatthu, (3) mañca, pīṭha, bhisi bimbohana, (4) loha-kumbhī, loha-bhāṇaka, loha-vāraka, loha-kaṭāha vāsī, pharasu, kuṭhārī, kuddāla, nikhādana, (5) vallī, veļu, muñja-babbaja, tiṇa, mattikā, dāru-bhaṇḍa, mattikā-bhaṇḍa. The same five categories are also defined as *avebhāṇgiya* (Vin II 171,32–38). To transfer one of these goods is to commit a grave offence (Vin II 170,25f).

Sp explains that *garu-bhaṇḍa* in connection with Pār 2 M describes goods worth five *māsaka* (Sp II 484,12ff). In the context of Pār 4 M, however, Sp refers to the Cullavagga passage cited above (Sp II 484,15–25). Here, in the classification of Pār 2 M, *garu-bhaṇḍa* must have the meaning “goods worth five *māsaka*” since only if this condition is fulfilled do we have the third *āṅga* necessary for an offence against Pār 2 M.

APPENDIX 19 (ad p. 187, n. 2)

kathina or *kathina* (spelling especially in Burmese sources) is the name of an ecclesiastical ceremony which consists of the spreading out (*attharana*, *atthāra*) of a robe that has been made up from *kathina* cloth (*kathina-dussam*) according to specific rules, the *kathina-cīvara*. Originally this robe seems to have been spread out over a wooden frame (*kathina*), probably the origin of the name of this ceremony. This spreading out of the *kathina* robe (*kathinattharana*, *kathinatthāra*) is carried out in a procedure (*kathina-kamma*) and opens up a period of at most four months during which the relaxation of five rules comes into force, the so-called *kathina* privileges (*kathinānisamṣa*). During this period the Saṅgha is entitled to receive further robe donations. The word *kathina* stands for the ecclesiastical ceremony opening the *kathina* period, it stands for the period itself, it further is used metonymically for the *kathina-cīvara* and the *kathinānisamṣa*. We, therefore, leave *kathina* untranslated here and stick to the literal translation “to spread out the *kathina*” for *kathinam attharati* which stands for “to open the *kathina* period”, “to perform the *kathina* ceremony”, “to spread out the *kathina* robe”. The opposite terms *kathinuddhāra* or *kathinubbhāra* we translate with “removal of the *kathina*”, which then stands for the removal of the *kathina* robe or frame, the ending of the *kathina* period and the associated suspension of the *kathina* privileges. This ending of the *kathina* period can be an individual ending for a single bhikkhu caused by the removal of his robes.

Appendices

571

impediment (*cīvara-palibodha*) and his residence impediment (*āvāsa-palibodha*) or it can be a premature ending by the Saṅgha who performed the opening ceremony. Cf. *BD* IV 5, nn.1ff.; *CPD* s.v. *kathina*^o; *DOP* s.v. *kathina*.

APPENDIX 20 (ad p. 187, n. 3)

nītthita-cīvarasmīm; this has been translated in various ways: Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, “When the robes have been settled” (*VinTexts* I 18); IBH “When the robe-material is settled” (*BD* II 4; Kabil Singh 1991: 29 [Niss 13 N]); Thānissaro (2007: I 190), “when a bhikkhu has finished his robes”; Vajirāñāñavarorasa (1969: 82), “[During a time] when [stored-up] cloth [made up into robes or not*] is finished up”; Norman, “The robe material having been used up” (*Pāt* 29.6); Āṇāṭusita (2014: 105), “When the robe[-cloth] is finished by a bhikkhu”, etc. As the explanations of the commentaries show, this refers to the state in which all robe matters are finished for a single bhikkhu: whether a bhikkhu has finished making up a new robe from the cloth he received, whether the cloth or robes accrued to him have been lost, etc., or whether the expectation to receive some more cloth is disappointed. In all these cases the robe matter is settled for him and thus the robes impediment (*cīvara-palibodha*), which would mean the *kathina* period to continue for him, is removed.

APPENDIX 21 (ad p. 187, n. 4; p. 202, n. 2; p. 206, n. 1)

ubbhatasmiṃ kathine; this has been translated in various ways: Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, “When the Kathina has been taken up by the Bhikkhu” (*VinTexts* I 18); this translation is wrong, since no bhikkhu who is not entitled to do so will remove the *kathina* cloth that has been spread to indicate the opening of the *kathina* period. IBH, “when a monk’s *kathina* [privileges] have been removed” (*BD* II 4f.; analogous also Kabil Singh 1991: 30, for bhikkhūnīs); Norman, “the *kathina* frame having been removed by a bhikkhu” (*Pāt* 29) implies the same problem as Rhys Davids’ and Oldenberg’s translation; Vajirāñāñavarorasa (1969: 82), “when the *kathina* (privileges) are in abeyance”; Thānissaro (2007: I 190), “and the frame is dismantled [his *kathina* privileges are ended]”; Āṇāṭusita (2014: 105), “when the *kathina*-frame privileges] have been withdrawn”. These translations show the attempt to express the various facets of the expression. Actually, what is meant is that this rule, i.e. *Nissaaggiya* I, applies when the *kathina* privileges no longer suspend it, i.e. when the *kathina* period is over for a bhikkhu. Since the end of the *kathina* for a single bhikkhu might be independent of the end of the *kathina* period for his Saṅgha, depending on circumstances, it might be wrong to translate “the frame” or “the robe” are to be removed. Thus, if one adopts one of the many meanings of *kathina*, “*kathina* [privileges]” would probably fit every case here.

APPENDIX 22 (ad p. 187, n. 6; p. 188, 1)

niṭṭhitacīvaraśmīm bhikkhunā ubbhataśmīm kathine. The word “by a bhikkhu” (*bhikkhunā*) following the word *niṭṭhita-cīvaraśmīm* (see Appendix 20) and preceding the words *ubbhataśmīm kathine* (see Appendix 21) has been linked at times to the following words, at times to those preceding it in the various translations of the Pātimokha. Rhys Davids and Oldenberg (*VinTexts I*: 18: “When the robes have been settled, when the Kathina has been taken up by the Bhikkhu”) as well as Norman (*Pāt* 2008: 29: “The robe material having been used up, the kathina frame having been removed by a bhikkhu”) connected it with the subsequent words, as did IBH, who interpreted the instrumental as a genitive (*BD* II 4 and n. 6: “When the robe-material is settled, when a monk’s kathina (privileges) have been removed”). Theroretically it could have served as the subject for both elements, but from the point of view of content, it cannot be linked with the second element in this function since the removal of the *kathina* stands for the end of the *kathina* period and of the *kathina* privileges valid during that period. But the end of the *kathina* period either occurs automatically after the lapse of the four months, or it happens to occur individually for a bhikkhu, namely at the moment his robe impediment (*cīvara-palibodha*) and his residence impediment (*āvāsa-palibodha*) are removed (which may be independent of the duration of the *kathina* period of his Saṅgha), or it may be ended prematurely by the Saṅgha (*Vin IV* 287,25–30). Therefore, *bhikkhunā* must be connected with the first element, i.e. with *niṭṭhita-cīvaraśmīm*, or it must be reinterpreted as a genitive as IBH did, and as the commentary suggests.

APPENDIX 23 (ad pp. 194f., n. 4)

Formally taking possession of a cloth one wears as a “requisite cloth” (*parikkhāra-cola*) is certainly not the intended purpose of the category *parikkhāra-cola*, but it is no offence either, since no rule explicitly prohibits this. However, on a strict interpretation of the spirit of the rule, one would formally take possession of three pieces of cloth (cut and stitched to size so as to practically be a *ticīvara* set) as a *parikkhāra-cola*, and not as a *ticīvara* proper. See for a discussion of this practice Kieffer-Pülz 2007: 41–45.

APPENDIX 24 (ad p. 212, n. 3)

In general, a *cetiya* is part of each monastery, just as the Buddha image house (*paṭimāghara*) is in later times. And as for the Saṅgha and the Buddha, the *cetiya* or *stūpa* is also an entity within the monastery with its own ownership rights, see Schopen 1989: 89ff. (= 1997: 89ff.). Gifts can be given to individuals, to the Saṅgha, to the *cetiya*, or to the Buddha, and the various Buddhist schools had different opinions as to whether a gift to the Buddha, the

Appendices

573

Saṅgha, or a *stūpa* (alternatively *cetiya*) was of greater value (Lamotte 1988: 630ff., especially 634). See for instance Niss 30 M (Vin III 266,12ff.) for the rules regarding goods apportioned to a Saṅgha and a *cetiya*. See also above, p. 288.

Things can be given to individuals, to a Saṅgha, to a *cetiya*, or to a Buddha image. No shares from what is given to a Saṅgha are to be given to a *cetiya* or Buddha image, and vice versa.

APPENDIX 25 (ad p. 242, n. 5)

The factor “receiving it first” is discussed controversially in the commentaries. Sp-ṭ II 416,15–21: “*tam harantassā ti* (Sp III 688,30) *puna tiyojanam harantassā*” *ti Mahāgaṇṭhipade vuttam. tam pana Mātikāṭṭhakathāyam aṅgesu paṭhamappaṭilābhō sa ti* (Sp-ṭ reads *sati*) (Kkh 123,12) *iminā vacanena na sameti. paṭhamappaṭilābhō ti* (Kkh 123,12) *hi idam dutiyappaṭilābhō āpattiya aṅgam na hotī ti dīpeti, tasmā Pāliyam Aṭṭhakathāyāñ ca visesābhāvato acchinnaṁ paṭilabhitvā harantassa puna tiyojanātikkame pi anāpatti vuttā ti amhākām khanti. aññathā acchinnaṁ paṭilabhitvā puna tiyojanam haratī ti vadeyya. vīmamsitvā yuttaram gahetabbam.* “**For him carrying [it, there is no offence]** means: for him carrying [it] again for three leagues”, [thus] it is said in the Mahāgaṇṭhipada. But this does not accord with the statement in the Mātikāṭṭhakathā where, among the constituent factors, there is the [constituent factor] ‘**receiving [it] first**’. For [the constituent factor] ‘receiving [it] first’ shows that ‘receiving [it] a second time’ is no constituent factor for this offence. Therefore, because there is no specification in the text (= Vinaya) and the Aṭṭhakathā, a non offence has been stated for one carrying it having received it back when it had been stolen, even if he [carries it] beyond three leagues again. [This is] our opinion. Otherwise one should say, ‘Having received it back when it was stolen, he carries [it] again for three leagues.’ Having considered [this], one should accept the better [interpretation].”

The opinion of Sāriputta expressed here is rejected by Coliya Kassapa in the Vimativinodanī-ṭīkā. Vmv I 335,10–16: *tam harantassā ti* (Sp III 688,30) *paṭhamam paṭilābhāṭṭhānato paṭṭhāya tiyojanato uddhami harantassā ti attho. tathā harantassa hi corehi acchinditvā puna dinnaṭṭhānato tiyojanam haritum vattati. keci pana “Mātikāṭṭhakathāyam aṅgesu paṭhamappaṭilābhō ti* (Kkh 123,12) *vuttattā dutiyappaṭilābhāṭṭhānato tiyojanātikkame pi anāpatti” ti vadanti, tam na yuttam, dutiyappaṭilābhassāpi paṭilābhāṭṭhāne pavisanato vāsatthāya gamanaṭṭhānato puna gamane viya.* “**For him carrying [it, there is no offence]** means: for him carrying [it] beyond the three leagues from the place where he first received [it], that is the meaning. For, similarly, it is suitable for one carrying [it] to carry [it] three leagues from the place where it has been given [to him] again after it had

been stolen. But some say that there is no offence even if one [carries it] beyond three leagues from the place where he received [it] a second time, because in the Mātikatthakathā ‘**receiving [it] first**’ has been named among the constituent factors. This is not correct. Because even in [the case of] receiving [it] a second time, one arrives at the place of receiving as with respect to the going again from the place [one] went to with the intention of dwelling [there].”

Kkh-nṭ 321,3f.: *pathamappaṭilābho ti* (Kkh 123,12) *attano athāya elaka-lomānam pathamuppatti.* etena acchinnanissaṭṭhappaṭiladdhānam paṭikkhepo.

“**Receiving [it] first** means: the first coming into being of the sheep’s wool for oneself. By this there is rejection of the receiving again of stolen and lost [items].”

APPENDIX 26 (ad p. 265, n. 2)

Kkh-nṭ gives the example of a bhikkhu who owns a costly rains robe, which he deposits before bathing (Sp has a similar sentence, but instead of “depositing” it reads “put on”, see above, pp. 264f., n. 5). For this bhikkhu the assault of thieves is a disaster, because he has to fear that they will steal his rains robe (Kkh-nṭ 336,5ff.: *etha pana mahagghavassikasāṭikam thapetvā nhāyatassa corūpaddavo āpadā nāmā ti āha anivatthan ti* (Kkh 134,27) ādi. “But here the assault of thieves is a disaster indeed for one bathing after having deposited [his] very costly rains robe [somewhere]. To this extent [the author of Kkh] says **the one without clothes**, etc.” Kkh-nṭ here tries to explain why the bhikkhu is described as “undressed” in Kkh). It remains unclear which action of the bhikkhu actually is understood as a violation of the rule, but is considered a non-offence because of the circumstances. Sp-t, in trying to reconcile the statements of Sp and Kkh, presents four interpretations, two of which refer to the present case: “For it should be said as follows: (1) ‘there is no offence according to [the offences entailing] expiation for one whose remaining clothes are stolen or lost and who puts on [or] searches for [a rains robe] on an improper occasion; (2) there is no offence according to [the offences of] wrong doing for one whose rains robe has been stolen or lost when he bathes naked; (3) there is no offence according to [the offences entailing] expiation for one putting on [his rains robe] at an improper occasion in case of disasters [such as thinking] that thieves rob an undressed [bhikkhu of his rains robe which he has put somewhere before bathing]; (4) there is no offence according to [the offences of] wrong doing for one who bathes naked [because of thinking that] thieves rob [the regular robes of a bhikkhu] who bathes after having put [his] costly rains robe on.”” (Sp-t II 440,11–17: *evañ hi vattabbam siyā:* “acchinnasesacīvarassa naṭṭhasesacīvarassa vā asamaye nivāsentassa pariyesantassa ca nissaggiyena anāpatti, acchinnavassikasāṭikassa naṭṭhavassikasāṭikassa vā naggassa nahāyato

Appendices

575

|dukkatena anāpatti, āpadāsu ‘anivattham corā haranti’ ti asamaye nivāsayato
|nissaggiyena anāpatti, ‘mahagghavassikasātikam nivāsetvā nahāyatassa corā
|haranti’ naggassa nahāyato dukkataena anāpatti” ti.)

|APPENDIX 27 (p. 285, n. 1)

|In Kkh °rājovāda°, in the parallel in Sp IV 742,24f. rājovāda-suttam. Thus the
|two Rājovādaka-Jātakas handed down in the Jātaka collection (Ja nos. 151, 334)
|are excluded as possible candidates. Sp-ṭ I 169,11 = Vmv I 34,5f., state that the
|Mahā-Appamāda-sutta in the Aṅguttara-nikāya is the Rājovāda-sutta. This prob-
|ably is the case, because it is stated in Sp I 82,3f. (ID 72, 196) that some theras
|preached a Mahā-Appamāda-sutta to the king, which indicates that it could be
|understood as a rājovāda. There are three Appamāda-suttas in the Aṅguttara-
|nikāya (A II 119,29ff.; III 364,7ff.; V 21,12ff.), and further ones elsewhere. A
|Rājovāda-sutta is further mentioned in the Sumaṅgala-jātaka (Ja III 439,6).
|Malalasekera thinks that this probably “is a descriptive title and not the name of
|any particular sutta” (DPPN II s.v. Rājovāda Sutta). In Spk I 168,12ff. a
|quotation is given with the reference Rājovāde ... āgatā, and in the Spk-ṭ I
|200,5f. rājovāda is said to stand for rājovādasutta. According to Hayashi 2014a,
|this is the relevant Rājovāda-sutta. The quotation given is found also in
|Rājavavādaka-sūtras translated into Chinese and Tibetan. Adikaram 1953: 99
|already listed some of these parallels.

|APPENDIX 28 (ad p. 287, n. 1)

|Kkh 146,14f. antamaso pārājikavatthubhūtena tiracchānagatenāpi. Kkh-ṇt
|351,5–10: idha bhikkhuṇ ṭhapetvā avaseso anupasampanno nāmā ti (Vin IV
|16,34f.) vacanato tiracchānagato pi anupasampanno yeva, so ca kho na sabbo,
|methunadhammāpatti� vatthubhūto vā ti āha antamaso ti (Kkh 146,14) ādi.
|tassa ca paricchedo methunadhammāpatti� vuttanayen’ eva veditabbo.
|“Because of the statement [in the Vinaya]: **setting aside a bhikkhu, the rest**
are called not ordained, here, even a male animal is indeed not ordained. But
insofar as not each [male animal is intended, but] only one that is subject to the
offence of sexual intercourse [Pār 1 M], [the commentator] says **even** and so on.
And that [animal’s] measure is to be understood exactly according to the
manner stated in the offence of sexual intercourse.” See also Sp IV 746,22–27:
ayañ ca sahaseyyāpatti nāma bhikkhuṇ ṭhapetvā avaseso anupasampanno
nāmā ti (Vin IV 16,34f.) vacanato tiracchānagatena pi saddhiŋ hoti, tatra
tiracchānagatassa paricchedo methunadhammāpatti� vuttanayen’ eva veditabbo.
|tasmā sace pi godhā-bilāla-mūngusādīsu koci pavisitvā bhikkhuno vasana-
|senāsane ekūpacāraṭṭhāne sayati, sahaseyyā va hoti. “And because of the
statement [in the Vinaya]: **setting aside a bhikkhu, the rest are called not**

ordained, this offence of lying down together arises even together with a male animal. Thereby the measure of that male animal is to be understood exactly according to the manner stated in the offence of sexual intercourse. Therefore, even if some [animal] among lizards, cats, mongooses, etc., having entered, lies down in the lodging place with one precinct that serves as a dwelling for a bhikkhu, this is [an offence of] lying down together.”

APPENDIX 29 (p. 325, n. 2)

Aggala (Skt *argala*, *argaḍa*) is used in the sense of bolt, bar, and in the sense of door panel (*DOP* s.v.). As a door panel it is to be understood when people approach a closed door, tap on the *aggala*, and then the door is opened from inside (D I 89,31 = Vin I 248,2). This is confirmed by the commentaries explaining *aggalam* by *dvāra-kavāṭam* or *kavāṭam* (Sv I 252,24; Mp II 168,7f.), etc. Von Hinüber (1992b: 24) tentatively understands *aggala* in the present compound (*aggala-tṭhapanā*) as “Türpfosten (?)”, but this meaning is not corroborated by other passages. *Aggala*, however, could stand here for door panel (*kavāṭa*). *Aggala-tṭhapanā* would then refer to “fixing the door panel [in the door frame]”. This is the interpretation based on the Word Analysis, where *aggala* is replaced by *dvāra* (Vin IV 47,31: *aggalatṭhapanāyā ti* (Vin IV 47,23) *dvāratṭhapanāya*). From the rule itself this seems to be a plausible understanding since the measure of plastering is the same for the door and the windows. If *aggala* had been used in the sense of “bar”, we would expect a similar statement with respect to the windows. But there, only the shutters are spoken of. Sp understands *aggala* as referring to the entire door consisting in door frame and door panel (Sp IV 783,26f.: *aggalatṭhapanāyā ti* (Vin IV 47,31) *sakavāṭakadvārabandhaṭṭhapanāya*).

Several commentaries seem to understand *aggala* at least partly as door bolt, Kkh-nt 370,16ff.: *aggalatṭhapanāyā ti* (Kkh 164,3, 7, 10) *ettha aggala-saddena tamsambandhato dvāraphalakasahitam dvārabandhanam adhippetam*. “For fixing the *aggala* means: because here, by the word *aggala*, there is a fastening together with it, the door posts together with the board for the door is intended”; Pāc-y 35,26ff.: *dvārabandhena aggala-sa avinābhāvato aggalatṭhapanāyā ti* (Pāt 50,21; Vin IV 47,23) *vutte pi aggaleṇa saha dvārabandhaṭṭhapanāyā ti attho va gahetabbo ti āha sakavāṭakadvārabandhaṭṭhapanāyā ti* (Sp IV 783,26f.). “Because of the necessary connection of the *aggala* with the door posts exactly the [following] sense is to be grasped, ‘for fixing the door posts with the *aggala*’, even though it is said: **for fixing the *aggala*.** [Therefore, the author of Sp] says: **for fixing the door posts together with the [door] panels.**”

Appendices

577

APPENDIX 30 (ad p. 334, n. 3)

The altogether eighteen cases of wrong doing are divided into triads as in the case of the unlawful procedure. The final group contains only two cases with offences, since the last is a non offence case: (1) there is a lawful procedure, and an incomplete Bhikkhunī Saṅgha, the procedure is considered unlawful, and the incomplete Bhikkhunī Saṅgha is considered incomplete, complete, or the bhikkhu is in doubt about whether it is complete, three offences of wrong doing (Vin IV 53,21ff; BD II 271); (2) the bhikkhu is in doubt about the procedure, three offences of wrong doing (Vin IV 53,24; BD II 271); (3) the procedure is considered lawful, three offences of wrong doing (Vin IV 53,25f; BD II 271); (4) there is a lawful procedure, and a complete Bhikkhunī Saṅgha, the procedure is considered unlawful, and the complete Bhikkhunī Saṅgha is considered incomplete, complete, or the bhikkhu is in doubt about whether it is complete, three offences of wrong doing (Vin IV 53,27f; BD II 271); (5) the bhikkhu is in doubt about the procedure, three offences of wrong doing (Vin IV 53,29; BD II 271); (6) the procedure is considered lawful, two offences of wrong doing, namely, in case the complete Bhikkhunī Saṅgha is considered incomplete or the bhikkhu is in doubt about its completeness (Vin IV 53,30ff; BD II 271).

APPENDIX 31 (ad pp. 349f., n. 5)

The somewhat more detailed parallel in Sp IV 810,31–11,3 shows that these are several cases, not only one, and that the entire passage stems from the Mahāpaccārī, one of the early Sīhalatthakathās. Sp IV 810,31–11,3: *gacchanto vā ti* (Vin IV 71,12) *yo gacchanto antarāmagge ekadivasam gataṭṭhāne ca eka-*
divasam bhuñjati, tassapi anāpatti. āgacchante pi es' eva nayo. gantvā
paccāgacchanto pi antarāmagge ekadivasam āgataṭṭhāne ca ekadivasam
bhuñjitum labhati. ‘*gacchissāmī*’ *ti bhuñjitvā nikkhantassa nadī vā pūrati*
corādibhayam vā hoti, so nivattitvā khemabhāvam ḥatvā gacchanto puna
ekadivasam bhuñjitum labhati ti sabbam idam Mahāpaccariyādīsu vuttam. “Or
going: One who is going for one day on the road, and during another day eats at the place he has gone to, for him too there is no offence; even if one comes back, exactly this is the manner; even one turning back after having gone is allowed to eat during one day on the road and one day at the place he has come to; one having eaten [with the thought], ‘I will go’, goes forth, turning back [insofar as] the river is full or there is fear of thieves, etc., knowing [it] to be safe, goes again for one day, [he] is allowed to eat. All this is said in the Mahāpaccārī.”

APPENDIX 32 (ad p. 352, n. 2)

mahā-samaya is used rarely in canonical texts. In the Sutta references it means “a great occasion” in the sense of a great congregation of bhikkhus and gods (D II 254.6 = S I 26,23). The other references are in the Vinaya in connection with the present rule. Actually, the description in the introductory story would fit in perfectly with the meaning “great congregation” since at that time many bhikkhus from various districts came to Rājagaha to see the Buddha. People then invited bhikkhus for meals, and the bhikkhus, doubting whether they might accept or not, declined. Then the allowance was given to eat a group meal on a grand occasion (*anujānāmi bhikkhave mahāsamaye gaṇabhojanam bhuñjitum*, Vin IV 73,29f.). Only in the Word Analysis is *mahāsamayo* explained as a time of great scarcity “when two or three bhikkhus walking for almsfood, they sustain themselves, [but] when a fourth has come they do not sustain themselves” (*yattha dve tāyo bhikkhū piṇḍāya caritvā yāpenti, catutthe āgate na yāpenti*, Vin IV 75,6f.). It may be that this explanation goes back to a misunderstanding of the word *mahā-samaya*. It is interesting to note that whereas the Mahāśāṃghika-Lokottaravādin (Pāc 40) also have *mahā-samaya*, the *Prātimokṣas* of the Sarvāstivāda (von Simson 2000: 214 II Pāc 36 M) and Mūlasarvāstivāda (PrMoSū(Mū): Pāc 36 M) read *mahā-samājāḥ* “great congregation”. Nevertheless, Sp IV 813,21–25, and Kkh in the present passage follow the explanation of the Word Analysis in the Vinaya. Concerning the development of an Eastern *samāja* to *samaya*, see von Hinüber 1986: 201f. (1994b: 195ff.).

APPENDIX 33 (ad p. 365, n. 5)

This sentence summarises what is stated in detail in Sp IV 828,21–29,5, and is taken over verbatim by Sāriputta in his Pālimuttaka-vinayavinicchaya-saṅgaha (Pālim 130,8–22). Kkh-nṭ (386,14–27) borrows the whole paragraph from Sp in explaining the sentence (Kkh 183,19f.). The Vinaya-vinicchaya repeats these regulations in verse (Vin-vn vv. 1297–1302). The basis for all these regulations is a statement by the early commentators in the Word Analysis of the Vinaya, in the definition of the word *atirittam* “left over [food]”. According to this explanation food is counted as “left over” when a bhikkhu has eaten (*bhuttāvī*), has been invited to take further food (*pavārita*), and has declined (implied in the term *pavārita*), but has not risen from his seat (*āsanā avuṭṭhita*; Vin IV 82,33ff.). With this regulation the food in that bhikkhu’s bowl is defined as “left over food”, and this does not fall under Pācittiya 35, as the *anāpatti* clause shows (Vin IV 83,15: *anāpatti atirittam kārāpetvā bhuñjati*. “There is no offence if, having caused it to be made left over, he eats” (BD II 331). Therefore the bhikkhu may finish his meal by eating what was already in his bowl. For the

Appendices

579

| definition of *atirittam*, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: II [Z 223]; for consequences of
| this regulation not discussed by the commentator, see Thānissaro 2007: I 392f.
| This statement in the Vinaya refers to a seated bhikkhu. The commentary
| extends this to the other three physical postures, walking, standing, and lying
| down. As Sp IV 828,26 explains, if one is invited while walking, the walking
| must not be interrupted (*gamanam na upacchinditabbañ*). Hence one invited
| while walking has to eat while walking, one invited while lying down has to eat
| while lying down, and one invited while standing has to eat while standing. In
| Kkh (183,19f.) only the present sentence takes up the long explanations in Sp IV
| 828,21–29,5.

| APPENDIX 34 (ad p. 374, n. 3)

| Here, the author summarizes several cases given in detail in Sp IV 839,10–16:
| *sace pavārito hutvā anatirittakatañ* (E^e *anatirittakanñ*) *ajjhoharati, pakati-*
| *āmise dve pācittiyāni, manussamamse thullaccayena saddhiñ dve, sesa-*
| *akappiyamāñse dukkaṭena saddhiñ. yāmakālikam sati paccaye sāmisena*
| *mukhena ajjhoharato dve, nirāmisena ekam eva. āhāratthāya ajjhoharato*
| *vikappadvaye pi dukkaṭam vaddhati. sace vikāle ajjhoharati, pakatibhōjane*
| *sannidhipaccayā ca vikālabhōjanapaccayā ca dve pācittiyāni, akappiya-*
| *māñsesu thullaccayañ ca dukkaṭañ ca vaddhati.* “If, as one invited, he swallows
| what has not been made left over, [there are] two [offences entailing] expiation
| in regard to ordinary food; in regard to human flesh there are two [offences
| entailing expiation] together with a grave offence; in regard of the other
| unlawful meats [two offences entailing expiation] together with [an offence of]
| wrong doing; for one swallowing, with his mouth containing food, [that is,
| edibles allowed] during a watch of the night, if there is a reason, [there are] two
| [offences entailing expiation]; without food [there is] only one; for one
| swallowing for the sake of nutriment in both cases the [offence of] wrong doing
| increases [in number]. If he swallows at the wrong time, [there are] two
| [offences entailing expiation] expiation because of storing up [Pāc 38 M] and because of a
| meal at the wrong time [Pāc 37 M]; in regard to unlawful meats, the grave
| offence as well as the [offence of] wrong doing increases [in number].” These
| cases are again quoted by Kkh-n^t 389,26ff. in the explanation of “all cases”
| (*sabba-vikappesu*).

| APPENDIX 35 (ad p. 384, n. 1; p. 385, n. 3)

| *durupaciñña-dukkatañ*; Sp II 312,8ff. and Vin-vn-t list eight types of offences
| of wrong doing, and then explain them. Vin-vn-t I 62,1ff. (ad Vin-vn v. 45)
| *dukkatañ ca aṭṭhavidham hoti pubbapayogadukkatañ sahapayogadukkatañ*

anāmāsadukkatām durupaciṇṇadukkataṁ vinayadukkataṁ nātadukkataṁ nattidukkataṁ paṭissavadukkataṁ ti. “And the [offence of] wrong doing is eightfold:

- (1) an [offence of] wrong doing because of an action preceding [the main action],
- (2) an [offence of] wrong doing because of an action together with [the main action],
- (3) an [offence of] wrong doing because of [touching the groups of things] not to be touched,
- (4) an [offence of] wrong doing because of wrongly treating [i.e. touching a plant, etc.],
- (5) an [offence of] wrong doing [laid down] in the Vinaya,
- (6) an [offence of] wrong doing because of having known [of another's offence],
- (7) an [offence of] wrong doing in connection with a motion [of a *kammavācā*, and]
- (8) an [offence of] wrong doing because of a promise.”

The term *durupaciṇṇa* was used already in the early commentaries since after the parallel to the Kkh passage there follows a sentence in Sp IV 852,9f., where the qualification of a behavior as *na durupaciṇṇa* is quoted from the Mahāpaccarī.

APPENDIX 36 (ad p. 407, n. 2)

The option of cutting a syllable for illustrating a meaning, not mentioned in the Vinaya, is probably listed here because such a behaviour would fall under acting without the intention to sport in the water, which counts as a non-offence (Vin IV 112,37: *anāpatti na hāsādhippāyo*). In Sp the same sentence follows a slightly different sentence, Sp IV 861,15–20: *api ca upari gopphake vuttāni ummujjanādīni ṭhapetvā aññena yena kenaci ākārena udakam otaritvā vā anotaritvā vā yattha katthaci thitam udakam antamaso bindum gahetvā khipanakīlāya pi kīlantassa dukkataṁ eva. attahajotakam pana akkharam likhitum vaṭṭati, ayam ettha vinicchayo, sesam uttānam eva.* “Except for surfacing, etc., stated with respect to the [water] above the ankle, moreover, there is an [offence of] wrong doing indeed for one [who is] playing, even for playing at throwing water, having taken water staying anywhere, even a drop, by any method — whether having gone down or not having gone down to the water. But it is suitable to write a syllable illustrating a meaning; this is the regulation in this context. The remainder is absolutely clear.” Only Jāgara seems to comment on this, Pāc-y 102,18ff.: *likhitum vaṭṭati* (Sp IV 861,19) *kīlādhīppāyassa virahitattā ti adhippāyo. kīlādhīppāyena attahajotakam akkharam*

Appendices

581

likhantassāpi āpatti yevā ti vadanti. “The intention is, it is suitable to write by reason of abstinence from the intention to play. [People] say that even for one writing a syllable illustrating a meaning there is indeed an offence [if done] with the intention to play.”

APPENDIX 37 (ad p. 416, n. 4; p. 417, n. 1)

Thānissaro (2007: I 453) says that it is hard to see any difference between this second method of an “assignment in the presence of” and the “assignment in the absence of” as described in the Commentary. He states that in the second case of the “assignment in the presence of” the one who is spoken to is “a witness who is not the second owner”. Though the second person clearly is not the owner of the actual assignment, he also is not a witness. This is evident from his response to the one who assigns. Unlike in “the assignment in the absence of”, where the witness says that he will give the robe to the recipients, here, the second person says, “Use this property of the bhikkhu Tissa … the property of the female novice Tissa … or give [it] away or do with [it] according to your wish.” He thus acts on behalf of a third party approved by him, most probably on trust.

APPENDIX 38 (ad p. 437, n. 4)

liṅga-nāsanā applies to bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs as well as to novices (Nolot 1999: 59). Nolot states that one who is expelled by *liṅga-nāsanā* “is left with no more than the outward token (*liṅga*) of monastic life (i.e., a set of monastic clothes).” She explicitly states that the translation “depriving of the robe” is inaccurate, referring to the fact that the nun Mettiyā has been given the white robes, but she is not made to wear them (Nolot 1999: 59, n. 8). But the passage Nolot bases her interpretation on (Sp V 1014.16ff., see below), does not prove this. The example given in Sp for a novice shows — and according to Vmv II 117,5–8 it is valid for monks too — that all elements belonging to the novice’s life cease to be valid instantly when he, for example, kills a living being. Thus he is left just with his robe on, and therefore needs to be expelled now by removing his robe (*liṅga-nāsanā*). Sp V 1014.16ff.: *tāvad eva assa saraṇa-gamanāni ca upajjhā-gahaṇañ ca senāsana-gāho ca patippasambhati, saṅgha-lābhām na labhati, liṅga-mattam eva ekam avasiṭṭham hoti.* “In that very moment, his (that is, the novice’s) threefold refuge and his taking of the preceptor and his taking of a lodging cease; he does not obtain [part of] the obtainment of the community; just the mere outward token (that is, the robe) is the one [thing] left over.”). The text explains further that there is no necessity for *liṅga-nāsanā*, if the novice is remorseful, and that he can be reinstated in his former status by again giving him the threefold refuge, etc. (Sp V 1014.21f.: *liṅga-*

nāsanakiccam natthi. yathānivatthapārutass' eva saranāni dātabbāni, upajjhā dātabbā. “[There] is no need to remove [his] robe (*liṅga-nāsanā*). Just as he is clad in his inner and outer garments, the threefold refuge is to be given to him, a preceptor is to be given him.” Thus it seems that *liṅganāsanā* literally is “removal of the robe”, that is, disrobing (so also Hüsken 1997b: 105).

APPENDIX 39 (ad p. 461, n. 6)

According to the commentary, thirteen different offices exist in the administration of the Saṅgha which are all conferred on the bhikkhus by agreement (Sp III 578,28; VI 1163,16). This number of thirteen refers to the offices as mentioned in a list in the Vinaya itself: (1) *bhuttu-desaka* (Vin V 204,20–28), and (2) *senāsana-paññāpaka*, (3) *bhanḍā-gārika*, (4) *cīvara-patiggāhaka*, (5) *cīvara-bhājaka*, (6) *yāgu-bhājaka*, (7) *phala-bhājaka*, (8) *khajja-bhājaka*, (9) *appamattakavissajjaka*, (10) *sāti-yagāhāpaka*, (11) *patta-gāhāpaka*, (12) *ārāmika-pesaka*, (13) *sāmaṇera-pesaka* (Vin V 204,29–34). In addition to the thirteen agreements, Kkh lists the agreement about the office of the *senāsana-ggāhāpaka*, which is mentioned in the Vinaya, too (Vin II 167,7–12), but is not included in the above list. It is to be assumed that *senāsana-paññāpaka* and *senāsana-gāhāpaka* are only different words for the same function. This is confirmed by the list of thirteen transmitted in the *ṭīkās*, where, for the commonly used term *senāsa-paññāpaka* of the Vinaya, the word *senāsana-(g)gāhāpaka* is listed (Sp-ṭ II 344,15; Vmv I 280,20; etc.).

It remains unclear whether the thirteen *sammatis* only refer to the *kammas* for determining the administrative offices, or whether it also refers to other agreements like that on the hall for the observance day, etc.

APPENDIX 40 (ad p. 474, n. 6)

Kkh-nt 427,5 = Sp-ṭ III 405,7: ***ghaṭṭanamuggaro*** (Kkh 236,20; Sp VI 1244,5f.) *nāma anuvātādi-ghaṭṭanatthaṁ kato ti vadanti.* “‘**A beating club**, means: one made for the sake of beating the facing [of a bhikkhu’s robe], etc.’, [people] say.” A more detailed explanation is contained in Vmv II 246,26–47,2: ***ghaṭṭanaphalakam*** ***ghaṭṭanamuggaro*** *ti* (Sp VI 1244,5f.) *idam rajitacīvaram ekasmin maṭṭhe danḍamuggare vethetvā ekassa maṭṭhaphalakassa upari ṭhapetvā upari aparena maṭṭhaphalakena nikujjivā eko upari akkamitvā tiṭṭhati. dve janā upariphalakan dvīsu koṭisu gahetvā aparāparam ākaḍḍhanavikāḍḍhanam karonti, etam sandhāya vuttam. hatthe ṭhapāpetvā hathena paharanaṁ pana niṭṭhitarajanassa cīvarassa allakāle kātabbam. idam pana phalakamuggarehi ghaṭṭanam sukhakāle thaddhabhāvavimocanatthan ti daṭṭhabbam.* “**A beating slab, a beating club** means: having wrapped the dyed robe around a clean beating club, having placed it above a clean beating slab, with another clean slab

Appendices

583

above, having turned it upside down, one having stepped upon [it] stays above. Two people having grasped the upper slab at two corners, pull and stretch it. In respect to this, it (i.e. a beating slab, a beating club) is said. Having caused [the robe] to be deposited in the hand, the striking with the hand, however, is to be performed at a time when the robe, its dyeing having been finished, is wet. But the beating with clubs on the slabs [takes place] at the time when [the robe] is dry for the sake of loosening the rigidity. [This] shall be shown."

APPENDIX 41 (ad p. 493, n. 1)

The name of Pācittiya 89 M is *nisīdana-sikkhāpada* (Kkh 245,8, 24; Sp IV 884,20). Niss 15 M is called *nisīdana-sikkhāpada* too in the Kañkhāvitaranī (Kkh 122,1, 17), but *nisīdana-santhata-sikkhāpada* in the Pātimokha and the Samantapāśādikā (Pāt 36,21; Sp III 685,20). Since in the rule itself (Niss 15 M) the subject is called *nisīdana-santhata*, and since otherwise two rules would bear the same name, it is probable that Niss 15 M was originally called *nisīdana-santhata-sikkhāpada*. Niss 11–14 M are rules concerning the materials used for a rug and the time period it must be used before a new one may be made (*santhata*); Niss 15 M concerns the making of a rug for sitting (*nisīdana-santhata*) with a border from an old rug; and Pāc 89 M deals with the measurements of a *nisīdana*. The question arises whether the *nisīdana-santhata* of Niss 15 M and the *nisīdana* of Niss 89 M are the same or different. In the Word Analysis to Niss 15 M *nisīdana-santhata* is explained as follows: “[Something] with a border is called ***nisīdana***; [something] made without being woven is a ***santhata***” (Vin III 232,17f.: *nisīdanāṇī nāma sadasaṇī vuccati. santhataṇī nāma santharitvā katam hoti avāyimāṇī*). In the commentary to Pāc 89 M, *nisīdanāṇī* is explained in the identical manner. In Sp-t (II 415,6–15) two opinions are transmitted, and the commentator states that the better one should be chosen. Sp-t II 415,6–15: *Nisīdanasikkhāpade pi nisīdanāṇī nāma sadasaṇī vuccatī ti* (Vin IV 171,15, Pāc 89 M) *ca Aṭṭhakathāyañ cassa santhatasadisaṇī santharitvā ekasmiṇī ante sugatavidaṭṭhiyā vidatthimatte padese dvīsu thānesu phāletvā tisso dasā karīyanti, tāhi dasāhi sadasaṇī nāma vuccatī ti* (Sp IV 884,16–19 ad Pāc 89 M) *vacanato idhāpi nisīdanāṇī nāma sadasaṇī vuccatī ti* (Vin III 232,17; Niss 15 M) *ca santhate catutthacīvara-saññitāyā ti* (Sp III 687,3f. ad Niss 15 M) *ca vacanato tam yuttam viya dissati. keci pana “nisīdanasanthataṇī elakalomāni santharitvā santhataṇī viya karonti, tam avāyimāṇī anadhiṭṭhānupagāṇī, nisīdanacīvaraṇī pana channāṇī cīvarāṇām aññatarena karoti adhiṭṭhānupagāṇī, tam karontā ca nantakāni santharitvā santhatasadisaṇī karontī” ti vadanti, vīmaṇsītvā yuttataram gahetabbāṇī*. “In the ‘rule about a sitting [cloth]’ (*nisīdana-sikkhāpada*, Pāc 89 M), too, [it is said, “**Something** with a border is called ‘a sitting [cloth]’”, and to this it is

stated in the commentary, “**Having spread it like a rug, on one end, in an area measuring a span according to the current span, having cut [it] at two points, three borders are made; because of these borders it is called ‘with borders’.**” On account of this statement; here (i.e. in Niss 15 M), too, [it is said, “**Something] with a border is called a ‘a sitting [cloth]’**” and “**by being called the fourth robe in respect of a rug**” [is stated in the Aṭṭhakathā thereon]; on account of these statements, this seems as if it is correct. But some say, “They make the sitting rug (*nisīdana-santhata*), having spread the *elakalomās* like a rug, that is unwoven; it is not fit for formally taking possession of it, but as for the sitting cloth (*nisīdana-cīvara*) that one makes by one or other of the six *cīvaras*, it is fit to formally take possession of it. And making this, without having spread the rags, they make it like a rug; having thought about it, the better one is to be accepted.”

Since in the commentary to Pāc 89, Sp-ṭ refers the reader to Niss 15, it seems that its author considered a *nisīdana* and a *nisīdana-santhata* to be the same thing. See also Thānissaro 2007: I 239.

APPENDIX 42 (ad p. 495, n. 1)

As several references for *sugata-vidatthi* — restricted to the Vinaya — show, the combination of *sugata* with a measure is not uncommon in the Vinaya (Vin III 149,12 [Sgh 6 M]; 232,13, 15, 22, 25ff., 31, 37 [Niss 15 M]; IV 170,31; 171,13, 17 [Pāc 89 M]; 172,13, 18 [Pāc 90 M]; 172,32; 173,2 [Pāc 91 M]). In this first part of the rule, then, there is no connection made with the size of a Buddha’s, that is, a Sugata’s robe. Only in the following sentences of this rule is this the case, since there, a second *sugata* is inserted, which then in analogy to the narrative in the introductory story refers to the Sugata’s current robe. Thus, this part of the rule is younger and belongs to the same time as the introductory story. As Schlingloff (1963: 544f.) has shown, the original meaning of the rule was that bhikkhus should not make robes of a measurement larger than the current robes of their time. Later, when *sugata* was misunderstood as referring to the Buddha, the measurement given is understood to be that of a Buddha’s robe.

APPENDIX 43 (ad p. 512, n. 4)

According to the summarizing statement at the end of the Sekhiya section, Sekh 1 has the “origin” (*samutthāna*), etc., of the first Pārājika (one origin from body and thought). Thus, from the *samutthāna* category onwards, the classification of Sekh 1 would follow that of Pār 1 M. This leads to contradiction of the classification. See for that above, pp. xlviif.

APPENDIX 44 (ad p. 514, n. 1)

adḍhapālaka-nigaṇṭhā; this term has been borrowed together with the entire paragraph from Sp VI 1213,6–25 (*adḍhapālikā*, v.l. °*pālakā*). The same text portion is also reused in Vin-vn-t II 290,5–23 and Pālim-nṭ II 357,27–58,19. A definition of the term is found only in Buddhanāga’s Kkh-nṭ 437,6–9: ***adḍha-pālaka-nigaṇṭhā ti*** (Kkh 255,8) *adḍham pālentī ti adḍhapālakā; adḍhapālakā ca te nigaṇṭhā cā ti adḍhapālakanigaṇṭhā. te hi upari ekam eva setavattham upakacchake pavesetvā paridahanti, heṭṭhā naggāpi addham eva pālenti.* ““**The naked ones, who are protecting a half** means: they protect a half, [therefore they are] protectors of a half; and they are protectors of a half and naked ones, [therefore they are] ‘naked ones, that are protectors of a half; for having put a single white garment in the arm pit, they drape [themselves] above, even though they are naked below they protect a half indeed.” Interestingly, a similar wording is used in the Sāratthadipanī of Buddhanāga’s teacher Sāriputta to describe an *ajīvika* who in contrast to an *acelaka* is not entirely naked (Sp-t III 241,11f.: *tattha ajīvako upari ekam eva vattham upakacchake pavesetvā paridahati, heṭṭhā naggio. acelako sabbena sabbam naggio yeva.* “There, an Ajīvika having put a single garment in the arm pit, drapes [himself] above; below he is naked. The Acelaka is in fact completely naked.”) The *ardha-phālakas* are a Jaina sect current in the first century BCE and during the Kuṣan era (Jaini 2000: 297–322). Jaini did not find an equivalent for *ardha-phālaka* in Theravāda scriptures (Jaini 2000: 306), and therefore assumed that the *eka-sāṭakas* (“one-robe wearer”) mentioned there correspond to the *ardha-phālakas*. But among the groups listed in Sp and Kkh there are *adḍha-pālakas* and *eka-sāṭakas*, and as a passage in Ud-a shows (Ud-a 330,20–31,1, UC II 862) there existed *eka-sāṭakas* who were compared with *eka-sāṭaka-nigaṇṭhas* who wore a piece of cloth in a similar manner as the monks in the reliefs identified as *ardha-phālakas* by Jaini. In addition, there are also *eka-sāṭaka-brāhmaṇas* mentioned in the Pāli texts (Mp I 167,21f.; Spk II 182,28; etc.), and, furthermore, the above description of how the *eka-sāṭakas* wear their single garment, shows that there existed several types of *eka-sāṭakas*.

APPENDIX 45 (ad p. 521, n. 2; p. 539, n. 5)

dussa-pallathikā; according to Lüders (1966: 5) this corresponds to a posture described in Skt by *avasakthikā*; it consists in a sitting posture that involves winding the garment around knees and hips as a support. *Avasakthikā* is equated with *paryanka* (Pāli *pallanka*) in MW s.v. And MW s.v. *paryanka* among others, the meaning “a cloth wound round the back and loins and knees while so sitting” is given with L as a source. Actually he has taken over this from PW s.v. *paryanka*, where the references can be looked up. Bareau (1953: 49) says,

“*paryastika* may be a posture of sitting on hams with hands going around one’s knees that have been raised up (*hattha-pallatthikā*), or a piece of cloth girt round one’s back, loins and knees while sitting on hams, corresponding to the posture of *paryaṅka* mentioned above (*dussa-pallatthikā*). *Āyoga-pallatthikā* which may be identified with *yoga-paṭṭa* seems to be a specially devised piece or strap of cloth ...”. The *yoga-paṭṭa* is very common, not only with ascetics, but also with gods like Śiva, and probably others (Sanchi, ca. 50 B.C.; Zin 2006: 155, picture no. 1: the ascetic on the lower right; Ajanta I, ca. 470 C.E.; Schlingloff 2013: I 219 (no. 45 (5), upper left).

Among the ascetic practices described in the Visuddhimagga, the thirteenth is the sitting-man’s practice, meaning that a person only sits, but never lies down. There are three levels: strict, moderate, and soft. The strict ascetic is not allowed to squat with his feet enclosed by a cloth (*dussa-pallatthikā*) or by a bandage cloth (*āyoga-paṭṭa*) which would facilitate his sitting upright. The moderate ascetic can use either type of the cloths as well as a backrest. The soft ascetic may use both and is allowed a backrest, a cushion, and either of two types of chairs (Vism 79,1–7).

APPENDIX 46 (ad p. 526, nn. 1, 2)

thūpato (Vin C^e E^e S^e), *thūpakato* (Vin B^e), (*thutho, thupato, dhūpakato*, Vin E^e vv.ll.); *thūpikato* (v.l. *thūpato*; Pāt S^e); *thūpikato, thūpakato* (Matsumura 1989); Kkh B^e E^e *thūpakato*, C^e *thūpato*, in the Vinaya and various Pātimokha editions (see also Nānāśūta 2014: 308, n. 728). The readings *thūpato* and *thūpakato* would indicate an ablative from *thūpa*, *thūpaka*. The compound *thūpikato* is known from the introductory story to Sekh 30 (Vin IV 190,32) where it is used as an adjective to *piṇḍapāṭam*, almsfood made into a *thūpa*, but the nom.sg.m. would not fit the present sentence.

The rules Sekh 32, 34, 35 (all with the verb *bhuñjissāmi*) have counterparts in Sekh 28, 29, 30 (verb *paṭiggaheśāmi*). Whereas Sekh 28 corresponds literally to Sekh 32, and Sekh 29 to Sekh 34 (except for the verb). Sekh 30 is formulated in the positive, Sekh 35 in the negative. But in both it could refer to the same situation. Sekh 30 says that almsfood has to be formally accepted level to the edge (*samatīṭhika*) of the bowl — that is, the almsfood should not extend beyond the edge of the bowl. Sekh 35 states that one may not eat the almsfood *thūpa(ka)to omadditvā*. *Omaddati* is used in connection with Sekh 33, where it most probably means “to pick, to grasp” (*tahām tahām omadditvā piṇḍapāṭam bhuñjanti*, Vin IV 191,26f.), and it leads to the rule that one should eat almsfood in regular order. In the non-offence clause to this rule, *omasati* (Skt *ava-mṛś*), “touch, pick”, etc., is used instead. This shows that both words are used in the same sense there. Whether this meaning is also to be postulated for Sekh 35 is

uncertain. It then would mean something like, “I shall not eat alms food having picked [it] from a *thūpa*.” That is to say, one should not eat from alms food arranged like a stūpa, or from a heap, or from the top. The meaning “from the top”, which is suggested as one option by the commentary, would only make sense if eating from the top was not allowed. In the light of Sekh 30, however, this rule could refer to the situation where someone has transgressed Sekh 30 and has accepted alms food extending beyond the edge of the bowl, thus obtaining alms food in a shape actually not allowed. It then could be that the bhikkhu who received this alms food in that manner tries to make it level to the edge, and crushes the heap (*thūpa*) or presses the portion extending over the edge of the bowl into a heap. Both translations are given in variants in the various Pātimokkha translations.

Sekh 35 is problematic. There are various attempts at translating it: Rhys Davids and Oldenberg (*VinTexts I*: 63): “Without pressing down from the top will I eat the alms placed in my bowl.” IBH (*BD III* 130): “Not having chosen from the top will I eat almsfood”; Norman (Pāt: 97): “I shall not eat alms food from the top, [but] having pressed it down”; Nāṇamoli (Pāt 1966: 78): “I shall not eat the alms-food working down from the top”; Thānissaro (2007: I 533): “I will not eat almsfood taking mouthfuls from a heap”; Nāṇadassana 2008 (no pagination): “Ich werde die Brockenspeise nicht in der Mitte [der Schale] zusammendrücken und genießen”; Wijayaratne (2010: 191): “I will not eat alms food when I have not chosen from the top (of the rice)”; Nāṇatusita (2014: 308) “I shall not eat alms-food, having pressed [it] down into a shall heap.”

In the Prātimokṣasūtra of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin the rule runs as follows: *na stūpakārakam piṇḍapātam paribhuñjisyāmīti śikṣā karaṇīyā* (PrMoSū(Mā-L) Śai 26), “I shall not eat alms food creating [the form of] a stūpa.” Eventually the word *stūpa-kārakam* is misread for *stūpākārakam* which is attested in PrMoSū(Sa).

In the Prātimokṣasūtra of the Sarvāstivādin there are two rules that are connected with the word *stūpa*. The first (C3) corresponds to Sekh 30 of the Pali-Vinaya, and to the largest part to Śai 26 of the Mā-L (*na stūpākāram piṇḍapātam paribhokṣyāma iti śikṣā karaṇīyā*, “We shall not eat alms food having the shape of a stūpa, this is a training to be practised”). The second rule (C 6) *na stūpyavaguṇṭhikṛtam piṇḍapātam paribhokṣyāma iti śikṣā karaṇīyā* (PrMoSū(Sa) 247), is understood by von Simson as “Wir wollen die Almosen-speise nicht essen, indem wir den überragenden Teil(?) verbergen. Das sollen wir lernen.”

In the Mūlasarvāstivāda Sanskrit tradition the rule is *na stūpākṛtin avamṛdyā* (v.l. v.Hi *stūpo- avapr-*) *piṇḍapātam paribhokṣyāmaha iti śikṣā karaṇīyā*

(PrMoSū(Mū): Śai 64). “We shall not eat almsfood having crushed the form of the Stūpa.” Concerning the variants in different Tibetan translations, see Schopen 2004: 336.

APPENDIX 47 (ad p. 546, n. 6)

paṭiññāya kāretabbam. IBH “it may be carried out on [his] acknowledgement” (*BD* III 153); “acknowledgement [of an offence]” (Nolot 1996: 99); “acting in accordance with what is admitted” (Thānissaro 2007: I 548); “he is to be made to do [the offence-procedure] through admitting [the offence]” (Ñāṇatissa 2014: 328); “[procedure of] confession/acknowledgement” (Stuart 2017: 232).

As a nominal expression, *paṭiññā-karaṇam* (“acting in accordance with the acknowledgement”) is used only a few times, among them once in the Vinaya commentary (Sp I 269,10), but never in canonical texts. More common, and the sole form in canonical texts, is the expression *paṭiññāta-karaṇam* “acting in accordance with the acknowledged”.

It is prohibited to carry out a procedure of censure against a bhikkhu without his acknowledgement (see, for instance, *BD* III 153, n. 5; Nolot 1996: 99). The Pāli is understood as acting in accordance with the acknowledged offence. As Borgland says, in the Mūlasarvāstivāda and Sarvāstivāda tradition, at least, the Sanskrit equivalent *pratijñā-kāraka*, unlike the Pāli, encompasses the assertion of guilt or innocence (Borgland 2014: 108).

APPENDIX 48 (ad p. 549, n. 3)

For the commentarial statement on Vin II 94.8–14 see Sp VII 1355,6–13: *antarāmagge vūpasantan ti na h' eva kho pana aññamaññam saññattiyā vā sabhāgabhiikkhunijjhāpanena vā vūpasantam hoti, api ca kho paṭipatham āgacchanto eko vinayadharo disvā “kattha āvuso gacchathā” ti pucchitvā “asukam nāma gāmaṇi iminā nāma kāraṇenā” ti vitte “alam āvuso, kim tattha gatenā” ti tatth' eva dhammena vinayena tam adhikaraṇam vūpasameti, idam antarāmagge vūpasantam nāma. “[A legal case] settled on the road means: but by no means is [a legal case] settled by mutually appeasing or by the kindness of bhikkhus of the same faction, but rather a Vinaya expert approaching on the opposite way having seen [them] asks, ‘Where are you going to, friends?’ When he is told, ‘To such and such a village because of this matter’, he [says,] ‘Enough, friends, what is the use of going there’, [and] settles the legal case just there according to *dhamma* [and] *vinaya*. This is [a legal case] settled on the road.”*

APPENDIX 49 (ad p. 549, n. 4)

Kkh 274.8 reads *niyyāti* (vv.ll. *niyyātentī*) *tam*. This should be corrected to *niyyātitam*, which is a parallel form to *niyyātam* (see Ps III 38,23: *niyyātan ti*

| *niyyātitam*); see also *DOP* s.v. *niyyāti*. This is also obvious from the commen-
| tary, which is a slightly revised version of Sp VII 1355,13–20. Kkh-nṭ 446,23–30:
| *yattha gantvā saṅghassa niyyātitam, tattha saṅghena vā ti* (Kkh 274,7f.) *sace*
| *pana* “*alaṁ, āvuso, kiñ tattha gatenā*” *ti vuccamānāpi* “*mayañ tatth’ eva gantvā*
| *vinicchayam pāpessāmā*” *ti vinayadharassa vacanam anādiyitvā yattha gantvā*
| *sabhaṅgabhikkhusaṅghassa adhikaraṇam niyyātitam, tattha saṅghena* “*alaṁ,*
| *āvuso, saṅghasannipātam nāma garukan*” *ti tatth’ eva nisīditvā vinicchitam*
| *sammati. na h’ eva kho pana sabhaṅgabhikkhūnam saññattiyañ vūpasantam hoti,*
| *api ca kho saṅgham sannipātētvā ārocitam saṅghamajjhe vinayadharā*
| *vūpasamenti. evam pi tattha saṅghena vinicchitam sammati nāma.* “**It is**
| **handed over to the Saṅgha, where one has gone to, or [if it is impossible**
| **that] the Saṅgha there** means: But even if they are spoken to [by the Vinaya
| expert], ‘Enough, friends, what is the use of going there?’, [and answering,]
| ‘Having gone just there we will obtain a decision’, [they go] not paying heed to
| the speech of the Vinaya expert, [and] where they have gone to they hand over
| the legal case to the Saṅgha of bhikkhus of the same faction; there [the legal
| case] ceases [through being] decided by the Saṅgha having sat down just there
| [with the words,] ‘Enough, friends, the assembling of the Saṅgha is a weighty
| matter.’ By no means is [a legal case] allayed through the appeasing of a Saṅgha
| of bhikkhus of the same faction, but rather, having caused the Saṅgha to
| assemble, the Vinaya experts settle the announced [matter] in the midst of the
| Saṅgha. Thus, too, it ceases, [through being] decided by the Saṅgha there.”

GLOSSARY

abaddha-sīmā. “Undetermined boundary” (lit. “unbound boundary”). Generic term for all types of monastic boundaries which are not determined by a community in a procedure (*kamma**). They are different types, namely, (1) a “village boundary” (*gāma-sīmā*) — including the boundaries of a market place (*nigama-sīmā*), town (*nagara-sīmā*), or a separate village (*visum-gāmasīmā*), (2) a “monastic boundary of seven *abbhantara*” (*sattabbhantara-sīmā*), and (3) a “monastic boundary [defined] by throwing water [or sand all around the assembled community]” (*udakukkhepa-sīmā*) in a body of water.

abbhantara. Lit. “interval”; a linear measure not defined in the canon, but corresponding to twenty-eight cubits (*hattha**) following the commentarial literature (Sp III 654,16; Vin-vn v. 2557; Khuddas-pt 93,25f.; Abh 147). Based on the measure given for a *hattha** in the Vinaya, one *abbhantara* corresponds to between 10.64 and 12.32 m (34.9 ft or 40.5 ft).

adhitthāti. “Formally taking possession of”. See also *DOP* s.v. *adhitthati*. A bhikkhu’s objects of utility like robes, bowl, etc., need to be formally taken possession of by him in order to not transgress any of the rules concerning these articles (Vin I 297,3–10).

ālhaka (Skt *ādhaka*). A fluid and dry measure of capacity, mentioned, but not defined in the canon; according to the commentarial literature four *pattha* correspond to one *ālhaka*, and four *ālhaka* to one *doṇa* (Spk I 218,28). Accordingly, one *ālhaka* corresponds to sixteen *pasata*; see *CPD* s.v. ¹*ālhaka*; *DOP* s.v. *ālhaka*¹. The *ālhaka* measures between 4,500 and 8,800 gr or 8,710 and 16,920 gr.

anāvāsa. “Non-residence”; antonym to *āvāsa**. Kkh 16,22 (above, p. 35) takes up a lengthy description from the Vinaya in which the terms *āvāsa* and *anāvāsa* are used. Thus, their usage in the Vinaya has to be taken as a basis for understanding their meaning here. With *āvāsa* and *anāvāsa* the Vinaya covers each area on solid ground, since every district outside of an *āvāsa* necessarily is *anāvāsa*. Since bhikkhus on their way to a certain *āvāsa* pass through land that is *anāvāsa*, it may also happen that they are still in such an *anāvāsa* district at the time of the observance (*uposatha*). Then they will naturally perform the observance there. In prohibiting to go to an *āvāsa* or *anāvāsa* under certain circumstances, the Vinaya generally forbids to go to any place where there are not enough bhikkhus of the same community (*samānasamvāsaka**) with whom it is possible to form a Saṅgha. IBH translates *anāvāsa* as “what is not a residence”, and states that, according to Sp 1066, this means “a place where a hall and so forth are undergoing repairs” (*BD* IV 178, n. 3). The explanation in Sp (V 1066,11–12) may result from the fact that *āvāsa*, at least in Sp, is also used for the living place of a

Glossary

591

single bhikkhu, and as such is a synonym for *vihāra** in the sense of *senāsana* (see Sp 1237,9–10 with Sp 574,30–31). Therefore *āvāsa* may be understood to be a building which serves as a lodging, and the negative *anāvāsa* is consequently such a lodging which is to be newly built or is under repair, i.e. cannot function as an *āvāsa* yet. See also Sp VI 1158,23, where *anāvāsa* is defined as a place where one cannot live. This meaning, however, would be misleading in the context of the Vinaya and in the Kkh passages based on the Vinaya. For more details, see Kieffer-Püllz 1992: 42ff.

aṅgula. “Finger [breadth]”; linear measure; about 1.5 to 1.8 cm (0.6/0.71 in.) according to measurement, or about 1.8/1.9 cm (0.71/0.75 in.) taking as a basis a forearm (*hattha**) stretching from the elbow to the end of the finger nail (Vin III 121,9; IV 221,10–11). Defined as consisting of seven *dhañña-māsas* (Skt *dhānya-māṣa*), a measure of grains (Vibh-a 343,28).

añña-vādaka. “1. (m.) one who speaks about something else, a prevaricator; ... 2. (n.) the offence of prevaricating” (DOP s.v. *añña*, -*vādaka*; similarly CPD s.v. *añña-vādaka*). Unlike Rhys Davids and Oldenberg (*VinTexts* I 33), IBH (*BD* II 231), and Nāṇatissa (2014: 176) who understand *añña-vādaka* in the second sense, Norman (Pāt 49; and xlif.) decided to understand “the -*aka* forms as referring to the male doer”, among others, because of the usage of *añña-vādako* at Kkh 154,15 (see above, pp. 304f.). In the rule Pāc 12 M itself, however *añña-vādake* as well as *vihesaka* do not refer to the person behaving in this manner, but to his behaviour (Kieffer-Püllz 2013: II 1291, n. 3). One argument for this is the fact that in the other eleven locative rules (dealt with in von Hinüber 1999: 33ff.), including the only other one with -*aka* forms (Pāc 13 M), the locatives always describe a behaviour, not a person behaving in a certain manner. In addition, the person for whom an offence arises, regularly stands in the genitive, not in the locative. This interpretation is further supported by the other Buddhist schools’ Prātimokṣas. There the locative rules are ablative rules, and the ablatives clearly refer to the behaviour: Sarvāstivādin: *any(a)vāda-vihetthanāt* (PrMoSū(Sa): II 207); Mūlasarvāstivādin: *ājñā-vihetthanāt* (PrMoSū(Mū) Pāc 13); Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin: *anyavāda-vihinśanake* (PrMoSū(Mā-L) Pāc 12; BhñiVin(Mā-L) 188). It should also be noted that the Kkh author gives the explanation as a person (tacitly reused from Sp) without connecting it to the rule by a literal *pratīka*. Where he comments on the literally quoted rule, he simply qualifies *añña-vādaka* and *vihesaka* as the subject of the rule. See also Kkh-nṭ 360,14, where the formulation *añña-vādakañ ca vihesakañ ca karontānam* (“for those making *añña-vādaka* and *vihesaka*”) clearly shows that tradition linked it to the behaviour.

apalokana-kamma see *kamma*.

ārāma. A park, a monastery. CPD s.v. ²ārāma “a place for pleasure, i.e. a pleasure grove, garden or park in a monastery, or (as pars pro toto) a

monastery itself". DOP s.v. "2. a pleasure-grove, a garden, a park, esp. one given for the benefit of bhikkhus (and containing shelters or dwellings)"; because such parks were used as dwelling places for monks, *ārāma* often stands for a monastery, also in *saṅghārāma*, *antarārāma*, etc.

ārāmika. Lit. "one belonging to an *ārāma*"; generally used for "monastic attendants". The interpretation as a gardener or park-keeper (Yamagiwa 2002: 380ff.) is too narrow. An *ārāmika* is a slave according to Kurundī (Sp V 1001,15–18), Sp (V 1001,11f.), Vmv (II 111,20f.) and Pāc-y (244,23ff.); he is free according to the Mahāpaccařī (Sp V 1001,13ff.) and Vjb (424,10); he is neither a slave nor free according to Dhammasiri's Gaṇṭhipada (Vjb 424,8f.). Cf. Kieffer-Pülz 2007: 15ff.; 2013: III [Z 287].

arañña. "Wilderness". Buddhists divide land in settlements, mostly represented by the village (*gāma** — sometimes town (*nagara*), and market place (*nigama*) are mentioned in addition — and wilderness (*arañña*) where there are no settlements (*agāmaka*). Wilderness thus refers to an area of land that is not part of any type of settlement. This is an area in which a *sattabhbhantara-sīmā** can be defined.

asamvāsa. "One who [incurs] the loss of communal life", "one not in communion" (lit. "one with whom one cannot live together"); *t.t.* for a former monastic who because of the transgression of a *pārājika* rule is automatically and irrevocably excluded from the communal life (*saṃvāsa** of the Buddhist community.

atthuppatti. Lit. "the arising of the matter"; CPD s.v. *atṭh'-uppatti* gives "occasion, esp. an occurrence giving occasion to a *dhamma-desanā*". Similarly DOP s.v. *atṭha*¹, -*uppatti*. In Kkh it is used as a reference to the introductory stories in the Vinayavibhaṅga. Kkh-nṭ explains it as the "provenance of the Pātimokkha rule" (*sikkhāpadassa nidāna*), that is, the introductory story of Sgh 9 M, see Kkh-nṭ 246,17ff.: *atthuppattiyan ti* (Kkh 74,7) *atthassa uppatti atthuppatti, atthuppatti yeva atthuppatti, tassam atthuppattiyam, sikkhāpadassa nidāne ti vuttam hoti*. In the arising of the matter (*atṭha*) means: the arising of the matter (*attha*; resolution of compound) [is] the arising of the matter (*attha*; compound); *atthupatti* is *atthuppatti* (different spellings); in the arising of that matter; that is to say, in the introductory story (lit. the provenance) of the rule".

āvāsa. "Residence" or "dwelling-place" (see also CPD, DOP s.v.); in the Vinaya *āvāsa* is not used for the dwelling-place of a single bhikkhu, but it is the residence of a Saṅgha, that is, the place where a local community assembled for procedures (*kamma** previous to the introduction of the "[monastic] boundary" (*sīmā**). Despite the fact that in commentarial literature *āvāsa* is used in the sense of a dwelling or lodging (*senāsana*) of a single person (for instance, Kkh 241,10; Sp 547,30f., 1049,19–24, 1167,7f., see Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 42ff.) it is used in Kkh 13,9 in a quotation from the

Page 641 job: 1272818

Glossary 593

Vinaya, and in Kkh 16,4, 22, 85,12, 93,18, 102,20, in passages heavily relying on the Vinaya. Thus it has the same meaning there as in the Vinaya, namely “residence”. See also *anāvāsa**.

avippavāsa-sīmā. “boundary for the [condition of] not being separated [from the three robes]”; this function is applied to a determined [monastic] boundary (*baddha-sīmā**), called also *samāna-samvāsa[ka]-sīmā**, in a second legal procedure; thus the *avippavāsa-sīmā* does not have an own boundary line, but in its course follows the *samāna-samvāsa[ka]-sīmā*.

baddha-sīmā. (Lit. “bounded boundary”) “determined boundary”; *t.t.* for a [monastic] boundary determined (*sammatā, baddhā*) by a community of at least four monks in a procedure (*kamma**) of the *ñatti-dutiya-kamma* type.

bilāla-samkhalikā chanda-pārisuddhi. “Cat’s chain consent and [declaration of] purity”; the commentaries explain “cat’s chain” by “cat’s fetter” (Kkh-ñ 156,24-29 = Sp-ñ III 278,15-19: *bilālasañkhalikā* (Kkh 18,7) *nāma bilālabandhanam*) and state that “the first link of a chain goes only as far as the second link, not the third”; therefore, consent and purity only go as far as the person they are given to. This means consent and purity declared in the presence of a bhikkhu who should convey them to the Saṅgha, who then informs another bhikkhu to convey them to the Saṅgha, do not reach the Saṅgha.

dvāra-bandha. “Door post” or “[entire] door frame” (Sp IV 783,27, 31 = Kkh 164,3, 5); not used in the canon. The few references in the Atṭhakathās show that it either refers to a door post or the entire door frame, since it is used together with *vātapāna* (“window”) to designate the doors and windows of buildings in their entirety (Kkh-ñ 240,8; Vmv I 277,7f.), i.e. comprising all elements of a door and a window.

dvāra-kosa. “A door-frame; the area surrounding the door” (*DOP* s.v.); the term appears only twice in the canon, in Pāc 19 M, in the rule and in the Word Analysis. Rendered as “door frame” by Edgerton (*BHSD* s.v.) and following him in the SWTF (s.v.) it is translated as “doorway” by IBH (*BD* II 258), “door opening” by Thānissaro (2007: I 349), “frame of the door” by Ñāṇatusita (2014: 184), etc., whereas Rhys Davids and Oldenberg in their translation of Pāc 19 (*VinTexts* I 35) omit it. In the Word Analysis of Pāc 19 M *yāva dvāra-kosā* is explained as *piṭṭha-saṅghātassā samantā hatthapāsā*. “Arm’s reach (ca. 1.08 m, 3.5 ft) all around the door frame (*piṭṭha-saṅghātā**).” Thus *dvāra-kosa* according to this commentator is not the doorway itself, but an area around the door frame of about one metre. This has been rightly seen by Ñāṇadassana (Pāt 2008: n. 118). The same explanation, a little more detailed, is given in Sp IV 783,18f. (see below). The *dvāra-kosa* indicates the area on the wall of a large vihāra (*mahallaka vihāra*) to be provided with two to three layers of coating. This is made plain by Sp containing quotations from the early Sīhañṭhakathā. Sp IV

783.18–26: *yāva dvārakosā ti ettha dvārakoso nāma pitthasaṅghātakassa* (C^e E^e; N^e °saṅghāṭassā; S^e piṭhi^o) *samantā kavāṭavittihārappamāṇo okāso.* Mahāpaccariyām pana “dvārabāhato paṭṭhāya diyadḍhahattho” ti vuttam. Kurundiyan pana “dvārassa ubhosu passesu kavāṭappamānan” ti (S^e ad vuttam). Mahā-attīkathāyām “kavāṭam nāma diyadḍhahattham pi hoti dvihattham pi adḍhateyyahattham pī” ti (E^e pi for pī ti) vuttam, tam suvuttam tad eva hi sandhāya bhagavatā pi *pitthasamghāṭassā samantā hatthapāsā* ti (Vin III 47.30) ayam ukkhaṭṭhaniddeso (S^e ukkaṭṭhaparicchedo) kato. “As far as the area around the door: here ‘area around the door’ means: a space with the measure of the width of the door panel all around the door frame. But in the Mahāpaccarī it is said, ‘From the door posts onward one and a half cubits (*hattha*; i.e. ca. 65 cm, 2.1 ft). In the Kurundī, however, [it is said], ‘On both sides of the door the measure of the door panel.’ In the Mahā-Attīkathā it is said: ‘A door panel may be one and a half cubits (ca. 65 cm, 2.1 ft), two cubits (ca. 86 cm, 2.8 ft), or two and a half cubits (ca. 1.28 m, 4.2 ft).’ That is well said. For exactly with reference to this the explanation as to the maximum definition has been made already by the Blessed One: **Arm’s reach** (ca. 1.08 m, 3.5 ft) **all around the door frame.**”

ehi-bhikkhu-upasampadā (also *etha-bhikkhavo* in the plural). The “come bhikkhu[s]” ordination carried out with the words *ehi bhikkhu* or *etha bhikkhavo* according to tradition is the earliest general form of ordination. It is practiced solely by the Buddha himself. People seeking ordination asked to receive *pabbajā* and *upasampadā* from the Buddha, and the Buddha admitted them to the Saṅgha with the words “come bhikkhu” or “come bhikkhus”. See for example Vin I 12.22–25, 35–13.1, and the detailed account in Sp I 240.4–41.7 (ad Vin III 24.5) and Th-a III 203.12–204.26. But if we check the texts, the *ehi bhikkhu* formula is rare in canonical scriptures — it does not appear in the canon except in the Vinaya passage quoted and in two stanzas of the Theragāthā (vv. 625, 870). Instead we have other formulas, as for instance, *alattha kho N.N. bhagavato santike pabbajam alattha upasampadā* (D I 202.28–32; II 42.1; M I 39.31–36; see Alsdorf 1968: 314, n. 3), but there are also other variants. According to Alsdorf 1968: 314ff. the *ehi bhikkhu* formula was added later, a position declared to be “not convincing” by Anālayo (2017: 266, n. 95) without giving any reasons.

gāma. “Village”; mostly used representatively for every settlement, i.e. including “town” (*nagara*) and “market place” (*nigama*); opposite *arañña**.

gāma-sīmā. “Village boundary”; the secular boundary of a village which may be used as a [monastic] boundary; *gāma-sīmā* is mostly employed as a generic term for the boundary of any settlement including that of a town or a market place. The *gāma-sīmā* as a monastic boundary belongs to the category of *abaddhasīmā**

Glossary

595

garu-bhanda. “Heavy goods”; (*DOP* s.v. “property or goods held in common by the saṅgha”). There are five categories of heavy goods, namely (1) monasteries (or parks; *ārāma** and the sites for them, (2) dwelling places (*vihāra*) and the sites for them, (3) beds, seats, bolsters and pillows, (4) metal vessels, and (5) ropes, wooden and clay goods (Kkh 233ff.; above, pp. 465ff.). Heavy goods may not be distributed among individual monks, even by a formal transaction or through an appointed Saṅgha officer.

gāvuta. Linear measure; a quarter of a *yojana* (*Dhp-a* II 13,4f.); see *DOP* s.v.; Skilling 1998: 155.

hattha. “A cubit” (lit. “hand, forearm”); a forearm as a linear measure; measured from the elbow to the end of the finger nail (Vin III 121,9; IV 221,10f.), corresponding to between 38 to 40 cm (ca. 15–16 in.) or 44 cm (ca. 17 in.) depending on whether one measures up to the end of the little or the middle finger. Identical with a *ratana**, and equal to two *vidatthi** (*Vibh-a* 343,28) or twenty-four *aṅgula**, since one *vidatthi** corresponds to twelve *aṅgula*.

hattha-pāsa. “Arm’s reach”; this distance is given as 2.5 *ratana* (*Sp* III 652,20ff., cf. *BD* II 18, n. 1) or 2.5 *hattha** (*Sp* IV 821,30). One *ratana** (= *hattha**) equals two *vidatthi**, and one *vidatthi* twelve *aṅgula** (*Vibh-a* 343,28). Thus *hattha-pāsa* equals 1.08 m (3.5 ft). This can vary slightly, depending on the exact measure assumed for a *hattha*. Cf. *BD* II 11; Rhys Davids 1877: 15; Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 84, n. 144; 87, n. 150; 194f.; 241f.

kamma. “Procedure”. According to *Sp* VI 1195,1–13, there are four types of procedures, they are enumerated in the sequence from the simplest to the most complex: (1) a procedure [that involves] obtaining approval (*apalokana-kamma*): it consists of a threefold request for approval; (2) a procedure through a motion (*ñatti-kamma*): it consists of a single part, namely the motion (*ñatti*); (3) a procedure [with a decision as] the second [element] after [putting forth] the motion (*ñatti-dutiya-kamma*): this procedure consists of two parts, the motion (*ñatti*) and one proclamation (*anussāvana/-ā* or *kammavācā*); (4) a procedure [with a decision as] the fourth [element] after [putting forth] the motion (*ñatti-catuttha-kamma*): this procedure consists of four parts, a motion (*ñatti*), and three proclamations (*anussāvana/-ā* or *kammavācā*). For all four terms and the legal matters to which each of them is applied, see Nolot 1996: 80ff. The last two compounds are not translated literally, since this would be misleading as stated already by Nolot (1996: 83, n. 20): “[*ñatti-catuttha-kamma*,] generally translated as ‘[procedure] with a motion as its fourth part’, which ... does not account for the fixed order — motion first — that is one of the conditions for the validity of the procedure.” The wrong order of the members of the compound is discussed at length in *Vjb* 94,8ff.

kamma-vācā. (1) “Formula for a procedure”, comprising the entire text to be spoken during a procedure; the length and structure of the formula depends

on the type of procedure (*kamma**). Accordingly one can speak of a *ñatti-dutiya-kammavācā*, etc. (2) Synonym of *anussāvanā* which designates the single or threefold proclamation that follows after the motion (*ñatti*) in the “formula for the procedure” (*kamma-vācā*) of a *ñatti-dutiya-* and a *ñatti-catuttha-kamma*. This narrower usage of the word *kamma-vācā* is also attested in the texts of other Buddhist schools; see Nolot 1996: 86, n. 29.

khaṇḍa-nimittā [*sīmā*]. “[A boundary with] insufficient markers”; this term refers to (1) a boundary whose markers are insufficient with respect to the manner in which they were announced (i.e., a boundary with a break in [announcing] the markers) and to (2) a boundary with markers that do not conform to the definitions of the objects suitable as markers (a boundary with defective markers). For further details see Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 137ff.

khaṇḍa-sīmā. “A [monastic] boundary for a part [of a Buddhist community]”, or “a [monastic] boundary that is a part”; it generally was determined in addition to a great [monastic] boundary (*mahā-sīmā**) that enclosed the monastery. Sometimes several *khaṇḍasīmās* were determined. It is separated from the *mahā-sīmā* area by a *sīmā*-interval (*sīmantarikā**) encircling it; it belongs to the category of *baddhasīmā** . The *khaṇḍasīmā* is not known from the *Vinaya*, but only from later literature.

Magadha-naṭī see *naṭī*.

mahā-sīmā. “Great boundary”; normally used for a *samāna-saṃvāsa[ka]-sīmā** which may also include one or more *khaṇḍasīmās** ; in contrast to these *khaṇḍasīmās* it is designated as *mahā-sīmā*; belongs to the category of *baddhasīmā**.

mānatta [penance]. A penance a bhikkhu or bhikkhunī has to undergo, when they transgress one of the Saṅghādisesa rules. The *mānatta* period lasts six days for bhikkhus, and fourteen for bhikkhunīs. During that period the monastics have reduced rights, and additional obligations. For details, see Nolot 1996: 116–122.

muṭṭhi (Skt *muṣṭi*). “Fist”; a linear measure. Used in Kkh 94,18, 19, and its literal parallel in Sp III 643,6, 7, 8. Two types of measuring five *muṭṭhi* are described in the Vimativinodanītikā (VmV I 312,18–21): (1) measuring four *hattha**, and as a fifth a *hattha* with the hand clenched in a fist (ca. 36 cm, 14.2 in.), leading to approximately 2.1 metre (6.9 ft) for five *muṭṭhi*; (2) measuring five *hattha**, each with the hand clenched in a fist, leading to approximately 1.8 metre (5.9 ft) for five *muṭṭhi*. Since the measure of a *sugata-cīvara* is given as the upper limit for a bhikkhu’s robe, and since its measure is given with nine spans (*vidatthi**) in length and six spans in width (about 2 metre [6.6 ft] and 1.3 metre [4.3 ft]; Vin IV 173,28/), the first method is excluded for Kkh 94,18, 19. For more details see Kieffer-Pülz 1993: 182, n. 46.

Glossary

597

- mutṭhi-ratana*. Probably a different wording for *mutṭhi*.
- nagara-sīmā*. “Town boundary”; in some texts mentioned in addition to a *gāma-sīmā**, but mostly subsumed under the term *gāma-sīmā*.
- nālī*. (Lit. “a hollow stalk, a tube”), a measure of capacity. Various *nālīs* are differentiated in commentarial literature depending on the region in which they are used. The *Magadha-nālī* (“the *nālī* from Magadha”) is given as the measure for alms bowls and other vessels. It is considered the relevant *nālī*, contrary to the *Damiḷa-nālī* (“the Tamil *nālī*”) which is small, and the *Sīhala-nālī* (“the Sinhalese *nālī*”) that is one-and-a-half times larger than the *Magadha-nālī* (Sp IV 702,22–28; for a translation, see Kieffer-Pülz 1993: 186). According to the *Andhaka-āṭṭhakathā* (after the first c. BCE and before the fifth c. CE) the *Magadha-nālī* corresponds to 12.5 *pala** (Sp III 702,22–28), that is between 450 and 880 gr depending on the grams given for a *pala**; it corresponds to six *pasata** ($1 \text{ pasata} = 4 \text{ pala}$) = 24 *pala* (between 871 gr and 1692 gr) according to some quoted in the twelfth c. CE *Sāratthadīpanī* (Sp-t II 427,16); according to others it equals 8 *pasata* = 32 *pala* (between ca. 1161 gr and 2256 gr; Sp-t II 427,17); according to the ācariya Dhammapāla Thera (tenth c. CE?) it equals 5 *kuḍuva* + 1 $\frac{1}{3}$ *muṭṭhi* = 21,33 *muṭṭhi** = *pala** (between 774 gr and ca. 1504 gr; Sp-t II 427,19–21). For details, see Kieffer-Pülz 1993: 185–188.
- nānā-saṃvāsaka*. “[A monk] belonging to a different communion”. The members of a Buddhist community able to carry out procedures together are considered “to belong to the same (*saṃvāna*) communion (*saṃvāsa**)” or as “having the same communal life” (*saṃvāna-saṃvāsaka**). If a monk is suspended by a local communion, he does not belong to it any longer, but is considered a member of a different communion (*nānā-saṃvāsaka*). Likewise monks who decide to follow a suspended bhikkhu are counted as belonging to a different communion by their own will in comparison to the community who has suspended the monk. For more details, see Kieffer-Pülz 1992: A Einl. 12.
- ñatti-catuttha-kamma-upasampadā*. Ordination by a procedure [with a decision as] the fourth [element] after [putting] the motion (*ñatti-catuttha-kamma*) is the regular way for ordaining bhikkhus and has survived to the present day. The Vinaya transmits three different formulas for it (Vin I 56,10–32; 57,10–25; 95,16–34), among which the last one is still in use today.
- ñatti-catuttha-kamma(-vācā)*, see *kamma(-vācā)*.
- ñatti-dutiya-kamma(-vācā)* see *kamma(-vācā)*.
- ñatti-kamma*, see *kamma*.
- nigama-sīmā*. “Market place boundary”; in some texts mentioned in addition to a *gāma-sīmā**, but mostly subsumed under the latter.

nimitta. “Marker” for a determined [monastic] boundary (*baddha-sīmā**); eight objects may be announced (*kitteti*) as markers: stones, hills, groves, trees, paths, termite mounds, rivers, and water. At least three markers are required for a *baddha-sīmā*; there is no maximum limit. The boundary runs inside the markers, thus the markers are outside the *sīmā* area.

ovāda. “Instruction”. One of the eight important rules (*garu-dhamma*) accepted by Mahā-Pajāpatī-Gotamī when the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha was established was that a bhikkhu instructs the bhikkhunīs twice every lunar month before the recitation of the Pātimokkha (see Vin II 255,11–13 [BD V 354] and Vin IV 62,20ff. [BD II 268]). Cf. Vin II 263ff. Hüsken 1997: 384ff. The exhortation consists of the eight important rules (*garu-dhamma*) that were accepted by Mahā-Pajāpatī-Gotamī when the Bhikkhunī Saṅgha was established. Hüsken discusses the possibility that more than the eight *garudhammas* were taught, suggesting that eight *garudhammas* refers to the eight chapters of the Vibhaṅga (Hüsken 1997a: 453f.), an interpretation rejected by Klaus 2003: 260ff. Instructions for the instruction by the bhikkhu agreed upon as a bhikkhunīs’ instructor, who is accompanied by another bhikkhu, are found at Vin IV 52,7–38 (BD II 267–69).

ovāda-paṭiggahanūpasampadā. “Ordination by accepting the instruction”; this refers to the ordination of Mahā-Kassapa by the Buddha through a triple instruction; see S II 220 (CDB I 678, KS II 148f.), Sp I 241,15–26, Th-a III 203,34–204,7.

pacchima-vassa. “Later rains [retreat]”, see *purima-vassa*.

paccuddharati. “To formally give up”; before one is able to formally take possession of (*adhitthāti**) an object of usage as a robe, bowl, etc., one has to formally give up the one previously formally taken possession of. See also Kieffer-Pülz 2007: 38, nn. 130, 131.

pāda. A currency; according to Sp II 308,28f. the *pāda* is a quarter of a *kahāpana* which, following Kkh-nṭ 206,9f., refers to the old *kahāpana*. According to the Vinaya definition 1 *pāda* equals 5 *māsaka* (Vin III 45,10f.).

pāda. A measure of capacity; equalling five *Magadha-nālis** (Kkh 233,21f.) that is about (1) 2,250 to 4,400 gr; (2) 4,355 to 8,460 gr; (3) 5,805 to 11,280 gr; (4) 3,870 to 7,520 gr. This measure is relevant for evaluating whether the metall vessel called *loha-vāraka* (a copper jar) is counted as heavy goods (*garu-bhāṇḍa**) — when it holds more than one *pāda* — or not (when it holds one *pāda* or less; Kkh 233,20f.). A *ghaṭaka* and an oil vessel count as heavy goods if they hold more than one *pāda* (Kkh 234,16f.); a *tela-nālī* counts as light goods that may be shared out if it holds one *pāda* (Kkh 235,25f.); see also Kkh 238,7f. (*ghaṭaka patta*, *thālaka*, *kañcanaka*, *kunḍikā*).

Glossary

599

pala. Measure of capacity; equivalent to one *musti* (pa. *mutthi**), that is, a fist (Hoernle 1908: 290; see *NWS* s.v.); relevant for evaluating other measures. Equalling 4 *karṣa* (*Manusmṛti*, *Arthaśāstra*, *Suśruta*, etc.; Keller 2006: 223; Olivelle 2013: 458f. (both according to *NWS* s.v.). 1 *karṣa* approximately 9.44 gr (KA 2.19),¹ leads to 37.76 gr for one *pala*; other equations are 1 *karṣa* = about 176 troy grains (= 11,4045 gr) resulting in 45.62 gr for one *pala*, or 1 *karṣa* = about 280 troy grains (= 18.14 gr) resulting in 72.57 gr for one *pala*. See also Kieffer-Pülz 1993: 186–188. According to *CPD*, s.v., a *pala* weighs approximately four ounces.

pañha-vyākaraṇīpasampadā. “Ordination by answering questions”; this refers to the ordination of Sopāka through answering a series of questions posed by the Buddha. See *Khp* 2 (*MR* 2), *Pj* I 75f. (*JUM* 78f.), *Th* 485 (*EV* I 485), *Th-a* II 202,15–20.

pārājika. “[Offence entailing] defeat” or “entailing exclusion”; *IBH* (*BD* I xxvi) discusses the two possible derivations of *pārājika*. The first, *parā* + *ji*, is given in *Kkh* 34.15, above, p. 72, and means “defeat” (cf. *MW* s.v. *parā-ji*, where one meaning given is “to be conquered”). This is followed by a number of scholars. The second derivation is *parā* + *aj*. This was suggested by Burnouf and adopted by Childers, and means “involving the exclusion” or “referring to the expulsion” of the one who commits the offence, translated by von Hinüber (1985: 62) as “was zu Vertreibung [aus dem Orden] gehört” (“expelled [from the Saṅgha]). As stated in *Pāt* xliii, “[T]he Theravāda tradition assumed that it meant ‘defeated’. Because of our need to translate in a way which fits with the explanation of the term in *Kkh*, we follow the tradition.” A detailed discussion of the term, including other possible derivations, is also found in Ven. Nānātusita 2014: cv–cx. He translates it by “involving disqualification” and “[one] who is disqualified”.

parivāsa. “Probation”; a penance for a bhikkhu who having committed a Saṅghādisesa offence, has concealed it. The probation lasts as long as the bhikkhu had concealed his offence. The reduced rights and obligations are the same as during the *mānatta** penance.

pasata. “[Measuring] a handful [the hand spread out and hollow]” (*DOP* s.v. *pasata*); measure of capacity; equivalent to one *kuḍuva* (*Abh* 482) or four *mutthi** or four *pala**; corresponds to between about 151 gr and 290 gr.

piṭṭha-saṅghāta (variants are *piṭṭhi*² or *piṭṭha-saṅghāta(ka)*). Is used thirteen times in the canon, ten times in the Cullavagga, and three times in the Pācittiya section of the *Suttavibhaṅga*. Most of these references are in a stereotype passage listing elements of a door and its lock (*Vin* II 120,16;

¹ Olivelle 2013: 458 gives 151 gr. He erroneously has reckoned 1 *karṣa* equals four *pala* instead of 1 *pala* equals four *karṣa*.

121,9, etc.). Since it comes second in the list after the door panel (*kavāta*), and before the socket (*udukkhālikā*), the upper loop (*uttarapāsaka*) and the various parts of the lock, it is likely that *piṭṭha-saṅghāta* here designates a door frame. *PED* (s.v. *saṅghāta* 5.) gives “door post, lintel”. This would also work in Pāc 43 M where *piṭṭha-saṅghāta* is used in the Word Analysis and the *anāpatti* formula. A monk who intrudes upon a family who is having food does not commit an offence as long as he does not enter further into a large house than an arm’s reach from the *piṭṭha-saṅghāta*. In the case of a small house, there is no offence as long as he does not go beyond the central rafter (*piṭṭhi-vamṣa**) in the middle of the house (Vin IV 95,13–16). Thus this passage also indicates that *piṭṭhi-saṅghāta(ka)* is some part of the entrance of a house. From Sp II 287,25–28 we learn that *piṭṭha-saṅghātaka* in a hut entirely made of mud is itself not made of mud; Mp II 168,7f. indicates that door panels (*aggala* = *kavāta*) are fitted into a *piṭṭha-saṅghāta*, and that this is done by skilled carpenters (Mp II 168,7f.: **phassitaggalāñī** (B^e *phusitaggalāñī*) *ti* (A I 101,12f.: *phussita*^o) *chekehi vāḍhakīhi katattā piṭṭhasaṅghātasmim* (B^e °tamhi) *sūṭhuphassitakavāṭāni* (B^e *phusitakavāṭāni*). “**Phassitaggalāñī** means: door panels well fitted into the *piṭṭha-saṅghāta*, on account of [their] being made by skilled carpenters.”); Spk III 60,24f., Ja II 95,13f. explain that *toraṇa* (“arched gateway, lintel”, *DOP* s.v.) is the name of the *piṭṭha-saṅghāta*. From these references it is clear that by the time of the commentarial literature *piṭṭha-saṅghāta(ka)* designated either the door frame as a whole or the lintel. Coomaraswamy (1928: 256) derives it from Skt *prasthā-samghātikā*, “upstanding pair”, and considers it to designate the door posts. Kkh-nt explains it by *dvāra-bandha** (Kkh-nt 370,11).

piṭṭhi-vamṣa (Skt *prṣṭhavamṣa*, *prṣṭavamṣa*). Central beam or rafter of a house put over two traverse beams positioned on the corner pillars (Eggeling 1885: 3, n. 2; Renou 1939: § 10). In Pāli the only canonical references for this compound appear in Vin IV 95,15, 24 [Pāc 42 M]. Pāc 42 M makes it a Pācittiya offence if a monk intrudes on a family having food (or enjoying sex) by taking a seat in that family’s place. In the case of a large house (*mahallaka ghara*) a monk does not commit an offence as long as he sits down at arm’s length (*hattha-pāsa*, ca. 1.08 m, 3.5 ft) from the door frame; if he sits down closer than that, he commits an offence. In a small house (*khuddaka ghara*) he commits an offence if he goes beyond the *piṭṭhi-vamṣa*. According to Sp IV 856,25ff. this is the middle of a house, a statement confirmed by the *tīkās* (Sp-ṭ III 76,10ff. = Kkh-nt 398,20ff.; Vin-vn-ṭ I 511,7ff.; etc.). In Ja I 475,30f. a bird alights on the end or top of the central beam (*piṭṭhi-vamṣa-koti*) of a house; in Ja II 16,6f. a demon lives on the *piṭṭhi-vamṣa-thūna*; in Ja II 201,19f. a house burnt down, and nothing was left but the central beam and the pillars (*piṭṭhivamṣa-thūṇa-mattam*); in

Glossary

601

Dhp-a I 52.2, a demoness is lodged on the *pitthi-vamsa*; Sp IV 785.5ff. makes plain that the *pitthi-vamsa*, like the roof plate (*kaṇṇikā*), is above; etc.

purima-vassa. “Earlier rains [retreat]”; bhikkhus are required to keep the rains retreat for three of the four months of the rainy season. The rainy season lasted from the beginning of the month of Sāvana (July/ August) to the end of the month of Kattika (October/ November). Since the rains retreat continued for three months, there were two possible starting points: (1) the earlier beginning of the rains [retreat] (*purimikā vassupanāyikā*) starting with the first day after the full moon of the month of Āsālha, or (2) the latter beginning of the rains [retreat] (*pacchimikā vassupanāyikā*) starting on the first day after the full moon of the month of Sāvana, (Vin I 137.23–31; BD IV 184). Those who take the second date are described as spending “the later rains [retreat]” (*pacchima-vassa*). Note that PED (s.v. *māsa*) says that the month of Āsālha is included as part of the rains. If the calendar of the Theravādin follows the *pūrṇimānta* scheme (dark fortnight, bright fortnight), as Vogel (1997: 678) states, then the month of Āsālha is not part of the rains. Cf. G 191: “The day on which the full moon falls [reckoning the day to begin at dawn] is the last day of the month.” Thus the statement that the retreat lasts for four or three months (CPD s.v. Kattika) is not correct.

ratana. A linear measure; the *ratana* is identical with the *hattha** (Sp III 652.20ff., IV 821.30), and consists of two *vidatthi**, and twenty-four *aṅgula** (Vibh-a 343.28).

sabhāgāpattiya. Lit. “offences that have [the subject matter as] a shared element”; *sabhāga-āpatti*, is divided into (1) *vatthu-sabhāgā* [*āpatti*], “[an offence] having the subject matter as a shared element”, (i.e. several persons commit an identical offence) and *āpatti-sabhāga* [*āpatti*], “[an offence] having the [class of the] offence as a shared element” (i.e. several persons commit offences which are not identical, but belong to the same class of offence; for example, two different *pācittiya* offences). For further information see Kkh 20.9–16, above pp. 42f., and Sp VII 1331.24–30; see Nolot 1996: 130f., n. 44. Kkh-nt tallies with this (Kkh-nt 148.25: *sabhāgāpatti ca nām’ esā duvidhā vatthusabhbāga, āpattisabhbāga ti*). “And **this shared offence** is twofold: [an offence] having the subject matter as a shared element [and an offence] having the [class of the] offence as a shared element.” Cf. Kkh-nt 149.3–8.

sāmaggṛ-pavāraṇā(-divasa). “[The day of] the invitation [subsequent to establishing] unanimity”: see Appendix 4.

sāmaggṛ-uposatha(-divasa). “[The day of] the observance [subsequent to establishing] unanimity [in a Saṅgha]”: see Appendix 4

samāna-saṃvāsaka. “[A monk] belonging to the same communion”. The members of a Buddhist community able to carry out procedures together are

considered “to belong to the same (*samāna*) communion (*saṃvāsa**)” or as “having the same communal life”. If a monk is suspended by a local communion, he becomes excluded from the same communion and becomes one who belongs to a different communion (*nānā-saṃvāsaka**). For more details, see Kieffer-Püllz 1992: A Einl. 12.

samāna-saṃvāsa[ka]-sīmā. “A [monastic] boundary belonging to the same communion”. In the Vinaya and in Kkh it is designated *samāna-saṃvāsa-sīmā*, in Sp and later writings it is usually designated *samāna-saṃvāsaka-sīmā*. It is a *baddha-sīmā**, and if it includes the entire monastery and possibly one or more *khanḍa-sīmās**, it is also called *mahā-sīmā**. For more details, see Kieffer-Püllz 1992: B Einl. 8.

saṃvāsa. “Communal life” (lit. “living together”); defined in the Vinaya as “one common procedure, one common recitation, the same training — that is communal life indeed” (*ekakammā ekuddeso samasikkhātā, eso saṃvāso nāma*, Vin III 28,20ff.; 47,24ff., etc.; BD I 48,9–12; cf. Kieffer-Püllz 1992: A 2.2.2). To be differentiated from this meaning is its usage in Kkh in the context of *theyya-saṃvāsaka**, where each type of activity connected with the counting of the years spent as a bhikkhu is understood as *saṃvāsa* (Kkh 29,23f. = Sp V 1017,3f., see above, p. 60). Cf. Vjb 430,4f.: *saṃvāso ti c' etha na eka-kammādiko saṃvāso, kin tu bhikkhuvassagaṇanādiko kiriyabhedo idha saṃvāso nāma*. “And ‘**communal life**’ in this context does not mean the communal life consisting in one common procedure, etc., but here ‘**communal life**’ means each type of activity such as counting the years [spent] as a bhikkhu.”

saraṇa-gamana-upasampadā. “Ordination by going to the [triple] refuge”; this early method of ordination (Vin I 22,8–22; BD IV 30) consisted in speaking the triple refuge in the presence of a bhikkhu (and not the Buddha). It was declared obsolete by the Buddha when he introduced the ordination with a *ñatti-catuttha-kamma** (Vin I 56,6–9).

sattabbhantara[-sīmā]. “A seven *abbhantara sīmā*; “a [monastic] boundary defined by seven *abbhantara**” measured from the edge of the assembly; belongs to the category of *abaddhasīmā**, and comes into being in a wilderness (*arañña**).

sattāhakālika. “[Edibles restricted to] seven days”.

sīmā. “Boundary”, especially “[monastic] boundary”; generic term for all types of boundaries.

sīmantarikā. “*Sīmā* interval”; a distance to another *baddha-sīmā**; especially the *sīmā* interval around the *khanḍasīmā**, which separates it from the *mahā-sīmā**.

theyya-saṃvāsaka. “One in communion by theft”; a person who pretends to be a bhikkhu, either by unlawfully putting on a bhikkhu’s robe (“thief of the

Glossary

603

- [outward] attribute [of a bhikkhu], *liṅga-tthenaka*), or by claiming a certain number of years as a bhikkhu (thief of the communal life, *samvāsa-tthenaka*), or by both (*ubhaya-tthenaka*). In claiming to have been ordained for a certain number of years, a person receives its position within the hierarchy of a local community, and thus steals the communal life (*samvāsa*).
- udakukkhepa-sīmā*. “A [monastic] boundary [defined] by throwing water [or sand all around the assembled community]”; boundary to be used in bodies of water, i.e. in a river (*nadi*), a natural lake (*jātassara*) or an ocean (*samudda*); belongs to the category of *abaddhasīmā**
- upacāra*. “Distance” between two *udakukkhepasīmās** or between two *sattabhbhantarasīmās**; equivalent to the *sīmantarikā** to *baddhasīmās*.
- vidatthi*. “Span”; a linear measure; corresponding to half a *hattha* or *ratana* (Vibh-a 343,28) or twelve *aṅgula** (roughly between 19 and 22 cm, 7.5 and 8.7 in.).
- vihāra*. *Vihāra* may stand for a dwelling place of a single bhikkhu or several bhikkhus, but can also be used for an entire monastery.
- vikappeti*. “To assign”; a robe or other surplus object which a bhikkhu does not want to formally take possession of (*adhitthāti**) has to be assigned to someone else, otherwise he transgresses one or other of the robe, etc., rules.
- visānketa*. “Flawed appointment”; an appointment that is not kept exactly as it was made.
- visuṇ-gāma-sīmā*. “Boundary of a separate village”; a special type of *gāma-sīmā**
- yāma-kālika*. “[Edibles allowed] during a watch of the night”; storing of this food is possible till to the last watch of the night only.
- yāva-jīvika*. “[Edibles allowed] for [one’s] lifetime”; that means there are no restrictions as to storing this food.
- yojana*. “League”; linear measure; the exact length of a *yojana* at the time of the canonical writings is unknown. In fifth-century Pāli literature a *yojana* corresponds to about seven to eight miles according to the investigation by Rhys Davids (1877: 15) which would equal about 11.2 to 12.8 km. In the texts of the twelfth century C.E. one *yojana* is given as equal to four *gāvuta*; one *gāvuta* to eighty *usabha*; or, five hundred *dhanu* are a *kosa*, four *kosa* are a *gāvuta* (see Skilling 1998: 157). There are further suggestions that vary between 4.5 and 12.5 miles; for details, see Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 67 and nn. 109–11; Skilling 1998: 154–62.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We want to thank Nalini Balbir (Paris) for references to the *adāhapālaka* in Jain secondary literature, Monika Zin (Leipzig) for references concerning *yoga-pat̄ta* images, and Rebecca Redwood French (Buffalo) for her clarification of the usage of specific legal terms; we express our gratitude to Peter Flügel (London) and Oskar von Hinüber (Freiburg) for the clarification of references, and Reinhold Gründendahl (Göttingen) and Anne Peters (Göttingen) for providing us with secondary literature. Last, but not least, we would like to thank Dhammadinnā Bhikkhunī (Taipei) for reading a draft of the entire penultimate version of this translation and for her corrections, comments, and references.

SIGLA

- * An asterisk after Pāli words indicates that they are explained in the Glossary
- [] added portions
- [000] page numbers of Kkh E^e 1981
- () explanations as to content
- <000>** page numbers of Kkh E^e 2003

ABBREVIATIONS

- | | |
|----------------|--|
| Aniy | Aniyata rules |
| <i>ARIRIAB</i> | <i>Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University</i> |
| B ^e | Burmese edition |
| <i>BHSD</i> | Franklin Edgerton. <i>Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary</i> , Vol. II: <i>Dictionary</i> . New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953. |
| BudSir | Buddhist Scriptures Information Retrieval, Mahidol University. |
| C ^e | Ceylonese (Sri Lankan) edition |
| Childers | Robert Caesar Childers. <i>A Dictionary of the Pāli Language</i> , Kyoto: Rinsen Book Company, 1976 (1st ed., London 1875). |
| cm | centimetre |
| <i>CPD</i> | <i>A Critical Pāli Dictionary</i> , begun by V. Trenckner, ed. D. Andersen, H. Smith, H. Hendriksen, Vols. 1–3. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1924ff. |

606	<i>Overcoming Doubts</i>
CSCD	Chatthasaṅgāyana CD-ROM, Version 4.0 (Igatpuri; Vipassana Research Institute, 1999).
DOP	Margaret Cone. <i>A Dictionary of Pāli</i> , Part I: <i>a–kh</i> . Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 2001; Part II: <i>g–n</i> . Bristol: The Pali Text Society, 2010.
DPPN	G.P. Malalasekera. <i>Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names</i> , 2 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1974 (1st ed., 1937–1938).
ft	feet
gr	gram
IBH	Isaline Blew Horner
in.	inch
KA	Kautilya's Arthaśāstra
m	metre
M	monk (in connection with the abbreviations for the Pātimokkha rules)
Mā-L	Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin
Mū	Mūlasarvāstivādin
MW	Monier Monier Williams. <i>A Sanskrit-English Dictionary</i> . Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1899.
N	nun (in connection with the abbreviations for the Pātimokkha rules)
Niss	Nissaggiya rules
NWS	<i>Kumulatives Nachtragswörterbuch des Sanskrit</i> , project of the German Research Foundation (DFG) by the Seminar of Indology and Institute of Computer Science at the Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, and the Department of Indology and Tibetology at the Philipps-University Marburg. (http://nws.uzi.uni-halle.de/legal?lang=de ; last accessed 17/09/2018).
Pāc	Pācittiya rules
Pār	Pārājika rules
Pāṭ	Pāṭidesanīya rules
PED	<i>The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary</i> , ed. T.W. Rhys Davids, W. Stede. London: The Pali Text Society, 1921–1925.
PTC	<i>Pāli Tipiṭaka Concordance: Being a Concordance in Pāli to the Three Baskets of Buddhist Scriptures in the Indian Order of Letters</i> , 3 parts, ed. F.L. Woodward, E.M. Hare, et al. London: Luzac & Company, 1952–1984.
PW	Otto Böhtlingk and Rudolph Roth. <i>Sanskrit-Wörterbuch</i> , 7 vols. St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1855–1875.

Acknowledgments, Sigla, Abbreviations

607

pw	Otto Böhtlingk, <i>Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung</i> , 7 parts. St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1879–1889.
Sa	Sarvāstivādin
S ^e	Siamese edition
Sekh	Sekhiya rules
Sgh	Saṅghādisesa rules
Skt	Sanskrit
TPMA	<i>Tipitaka Pāli–Mranmā–Abhidhān</i> , vols. 1ff., Rankun: Kambhā 'Eh Praññ thon cu Mranmā nuiñ ñam Buddha sāsanā aphvai pum nhip tuik, 1964ff.
t.t.	<i>terminus technicus</i>
UPT	U Pho Thi collection of manuscripts (http://www.cari.ne.jp/MyanmarPJ/index.html)

Page 657 job: 1272818

REFERENCES : PRIMARY LITERATURE

- A *Aṅguttara-Nikāya*, 5 vols., ed. R. Morris, E. Hardy. London: The Pali Text Society, 1885–1900.
- Abh *Abhidhānapadipikā* (CSCD).
- Abhidh-av-nṭ Abhidhammāvatāra-navaṭṭikā, Abhidhammatthavikāsinī (CSCD).
- As *The Atthasālinī. Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Dhammasaṅgani*, ed. Eward Müller. London, revised edition: The Pali Text Society, 1979 (1st ed., 1897).
- BD I.B. Horner (trans.). *The Book of the Discipline (Vinaya-Piṭaka)*, 6 vols. London: Luzac & Company, 1938–1966 (Sacred Books of the Buddhists 10, 11, 13, 14, 20, 25).
- BhnīVin(Mā-L) *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya: Including Bhikṣuṇī-Prakīrṇaka and a Summary of the Bhikṣu-Prakīrṇaka of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin*, ed. Gustav Roth. Patna: Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series, 1970.
- Bv-a *Madhuratthavilāsinī nāma Buddhavamsaṭṭhakathā of Bhadantācariya Buddhadatta Mahāthera*, ed. I. B. Horner. London: The Pali Text Society, 1978.
- CDB *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha: A New Translation of the Saṃyutta Nikāya*, 2 vols., trans. Bhikkhu Bodhi. Oxford: The Pali Text Society / Wisdom Publications, 2000.
- CI *The Commentary on the Itivuttaka: The Itivuttaka-aṭṭhakathā (Paramatthadīpanī II) of Dhammadipaṭṭala*, 2 vols., trans. Peter Masefield. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 2008, 2009.
- Cp N.A. Jayawickrama, ed. Cariyāpiṭaka in *Buddhavamsa and Cariyāpiṭaka*. London: The Pali Text Society, 1974.
- Cp-a D.L. Barua, ed. Cariyāpiṭaka-Aṭṭhakathā in *Achariya Dhammapāla's Paramatthadīpanī: Being the Commentary on the CariyāPiṭaka*. London: The Pali Text Society, 1979 (1st ed., 1939).
- D T.W. Rhys Davids and J.E. Carpenter, eds. *Dīghanikāya*, 3 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1890–1911.
- DB Bhikkhu Nyānaponika, trans. Sven Bretfeld and Rainer Knopf, eds. *Darlegung der Bedeutung (Atthasālinī: Der Kommentar zur Dhammasaṅgani)*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 2005.
- DD Bhikkhu Nāṇamoli, trans., revised by L.S. Cousins, Nyanaponika Mahathera, and C.M.M. Shaw. *The Dispeller of Delusion (Sammohavinodanī)*, 2 vols. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 1996 (1st ed., 1987).

609

610

Overcoming Doubts

- Dhp O. von Hinüber and K.R. Norman, eds., with a word index compiled by Shoko Tabata and Tetsuya Tabata. *Dhammapada*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 1995.
- Dhp-a [Dhammapada-āṭṭhakathā]. H.C. Norman, ed. *The Commentary on the Dhammapada*, 4 vols., London: Luzac & Company, 1970 (1st ed., 1906).
- EV K.R. Norman, trans. *The Elders Verses I: Theragāthā* (2nd ed.). Lancaster: The Pali Text Society, 2007.
- G Bhikkhu Nāṇamoli, trans. *The Guide (Netti-ppakaraṇam) According to Kaccāna Thera*. London: The Pali Text Society, 1977.
- GD K.R. Norman, trans. *The Group of Discourses (Suttanipāta)*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 2015 (1st ed. 2001).
- GS F.L. Woodward and E.M. Hare, trans. *The Book of the Gradual Sayings*, 5 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1932–1936.
- ID N.A. Jayawickrama, trans. *The Inception of Discipline and the Vinaya Nidāna: Being a Translation and Edition of the Bāhira-nidāna of Buddhaghosa's Samantapāśādikā, the Vinaya Commentary*. London: The Pali Text Society, 1986.
- It Ernst Windisch, ed. *Iti-vuttaka*. London: The Pali Text Society, 1975.
- It-a M.M. Bose, ed. *Paramattha-Dīpanī, Iti-vuttaka-āṭṭhakathā: (Iti-vuttaka commentary) of Dhammapālācariya*, 2 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1977.
- IUM Bhikkhu Nāṇamoli, trans. *The Illustrator of Ultimate Meaning (Paramatthajotikā, Part I): Commentary on the Minor Readings by Bhadantācariya Buddhaghosa*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 2005.
- Ja V. Fausbøll, ed. *The Jātaka Together with Its Commentary: Being tales of the anterior births of Gotama Buddha*, 6 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1962–64 (1st ed., 1877–1896).
- Khp Helmer Smith, ed. *The Khuddaka-Pāṭha Together with Its Commentary Paramatthajotikā I*. London: The Pali Text Society, 1978 (1st ed., 1915).
- Khuddas [Buddhadatta.] Khuddasikkhā, in: *Khuddasikkhā-Mūlasikkhā, Khuddasikkhā-purāṇa-abhinava-ṭīkā, Mūlasikkhā-ṭīkā*. Rangoon: Chatṭha-saṅgīti, 1962, 1–57.
- Khuddas-nt [Saṅgharakkhita.] Sumaṅgalappasādanī nāma Khuddasikkhā-abhinava-ṭīkā, in: *Khuddasikkhā-Mūlasikkhā, Khuddasikkhā-purāṇa-abhinava-ṭīkā, Mūlasikkhā-ṭīkā*. Rangoon: Chatṭhasaṅgīti, 1962, 237–441.

References: Primary Literature

611

- Khuddas-pt Khuddasikkhā-purāṇaṭīkā in: *Khuddasikkhā-Mūlasikkhā, Khuddasikkhā-purāṇa-abhinava-ṭīkā, Mūlasikkhā-ṭīkā*, Rangoon: Chattha-saṅgīti, 1962, 59–235.
- Kkh *Kaṅkhāvitaranī* (Kkh and Kkh E^e unless otherwise noted refer to Kkh E^e 2003).
- B^e edition on CSCD.
- B^e 1912 *Kaṅkhāvitaranīṭṭhakathāpāṭh*, Rankun: Jambū mit chve piṭakat pum nhip tuik, 1912.
- C^e Buddhaghosa, *Kaṅkhāvitaranī nāma Pātimokkha Vanṇanā*, ed. Kālavila Indaratana. Dehivala: Bauddha saṃskṛtika madhyasthānaya, 2012 (1st ed., 1930).
- E^e 1981 *Kaṅkhāvitaranī nāma Mātikāṭṭhakathā. Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Pātimokkha*, Dorothy Maskell, ed. London: The Pali Text Society.
- E^e 2003 *Kaṅkhāvitaranī by Bhadantācariya Buddhaghosa*, ed. by K.R. Norman and William Pruitt. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 2003.
- Kkh-nt Buddhanāga, *Vinayatthamañjūsā nāma Kaṅkhāvitaranī-abhinava-ṭīkā*. Rangoon: Chattha-saṅgīti, 1961: 118–489 (in one volume with Kkh-pt).
- Kkh-pipo Kalukoñdayavē Paññāsekharā, ed. *Kaṅkhāvitaranī piṭapota*. Colombo: Mahābodhi Press, 1936.
- Kkh-pt *Kaṅkhāvitaranī-purāṇaṭīkā*. Rangoon: Chattha-saṅgīti, 1961: 1–117 (in one volume with Kkh-nt).
- KS *The Book of the Kindred Sayings: (Samyutta-Nikāya) or Grouped Suttas*, 5 vols. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 1999–2005 (1st ed., 1917–30).
- M V. Trenckner and R. Chalmers, eds. *Majjhima-Nikāya*, 3 vols., London: The Pali Text Society, 1888–1899.
- Mil V. Trenckner, ed. *The Milindapañho: Being Dialogues between King Milinda and the Buddhist Sage Nāgasena*. London: The Pali Text Society, 1986 (1st ed., 1880).
- MLDB Bhikkhu Nāṇamoli and Bhikkhu Bodhi, trans. *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha. A Translation of the Majjhima Nikāya*. Revised edition. Oxford: The Pali Text Society / Wisdom Publications, 2001 (1st ed., 1995).
- Mp Max Walleser and Hermann Kopp, eds. *Manorathapūraṇī: Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Āṅguttara-nikāya*, 5 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1973–1977 (1st ed., 1924–1956).

612

Overcoming Doubts

- Mp-nt Primož Pecenko, ed. *Aṅguttaranikāyaṭīkā catutthā Sārattha-mañjūṣā*, 2 vols. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1996–1999.
- Mp-pt Primož Pecenko and Tamara Ditrich, eds. *Aṅguttaranikāyapurāṇaṭīkā catutthā Līnatthapakāśinī*. Bristol: The Pali Text Society, 2012.
- MQ I.B. Horner, trans. *Milinda's Questions*, 2 vols. London: Luzac & Company, 1969.
- MR Bhikkhu Nāṇamoli, trans. *The Minor Readings (Khuddakapāṭha) : The First Book of the Minor Collection (Khuddakanikāya)*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 2005 (1st ed., 1960).
- Mūlas [Mūlasikkhā] in: *Khuddasikkhā-Mūlasikkhā, Khuddasikkhā-purāṇa-abhinava-ṭīkā, Mūlasikkhā-ṭīkā*. Rangoon: Chatṭhasaṅgīti, 1962: 443–56.
- Mūlas-t Mūlasikkhā-ṭīkā in: *Khuddasikkhā-Mūlasikkhā, Khuddasikkhā-purāṇa-abhinava-ṭīkā, Mūlasikkhā-ṭīkā*. Rangoon: Chatṭhasaṅgīti, 1962: 457–98.
- NDB Bhikkhu Bodhi, trans. *The Numerical Discourses of the Buddha: A Translation of the Aṅguttara Nikāya*. Bristol: The Pali Text Society/Wisdom Publications, 2012.
- Nett E. Hardy, ed. *The Nettipakarana with Extracts from Dhammapāla's Commentary*. London: Pali Text Society, 1902.
- Nidd-a I A.P. Buddhadatta, ed. *Upasena, Saddhammapajjotikā I, Mahā-niddesaṭṭhakathā*, 2 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1980 (1st ed., 1931, 1939).
- Pāc-y Jāgara, *Pācītyādiyojanā*. Rangoon: Chatṭhasaṅgīti, 1972.
- Pālim Sāriputta [from Poñonnaruva], *Pālimuttakavinyavinicchayasaṅgaha (Vinayasāṅgahatthakathā)*. Rangoon: Chatṭhasaṅgīti, 1960.
- Pālim-nt Toñ-phī-lā Charā-tō Munindaghosa (Tipitakālaṅkāra, *Pālimuttaka-vinyavinicchayanavaṭīkā*) *Vinayālaṅkāraṭīkā*, 2 vols. Rangoon: Chatṭhasaṅgīti, 1962.
- Pāt William Pruitt, ed.; K. R. Norman, trans. *The Pātimokkha*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, reprint with corrections 2008 (1st ed., 2001).
- Pāt 1939 R.D. Vadekar, ed. *Pātimokkha* [Pāli Text in Devanāgarī Characters Containing the Bhikkhu-pātimokkha and Bhikkhunī-pātimokkha]. Poona (Bhandarkar Oriental Series, No. 1).
- Pāt 1966 Nāṇamoli Thera, ed. and trans. *The Pātimokkha. 227 Fundamental Rules of a Bhikkhu*. Bangkok: The Social Science Association Press of Thailand.
- Pāt 2008 Bhikkhu-Pātimokkha. *Das Hauptregelwerk der buddhistischen Mönche. Mit Anmerkungen und Notizen zur Verhaltensethik (Vinaya) im Anhang*. Zum ersten Male vollständig aus dem Pāli ins Deutsche

References: Primary Literature

613

übersetzt von Bhikkhu Nāṇadassana, 4. überarbeitete Auflage (zur Internet-Veröffentlichung).

<http://www.palikanon.com/vinaya/patimokkha/patimokkha.pdf> (last accessed, 11/10/2017).

Pāt-gd Nāṇakitti, *Bhikkhupatimokkha sametā Ganṭhidīpanī*. Payiyāgala Vimalaramsi Tissa, ed. Alutgama: Saddhammappakāsa, 1927.

Paṭis-a C.V. Joshi, ed. [Paṭisambhidāmagga-Āṭṭhakathā] *Saddhammapakāśinī: Commentary on the Paṭisambhidāmagga*, 3 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1979 (1st ed., 1933, 1941, 1947).

Pj I Paramatthajotikā I; see Khp.

PoP Bhikkhu Nāṇamoli, trans. *The Path of Purification (Visuddhimagga)*, Colombo: Buddhist Publication Society, 2010 (1st ed., 1975).

PrMoSū(Mā-L) N. Tatia, ed. *Prātimokṣasūtram of the Lokottaravādimahā-sāṅghika*. Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayawal Research Institute, 1976 (Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series, 16).

PrMoSū(Mū) Haiyan Hu-von Hinüber, ed. *Das Bhikṣu-Prātimokṣasūtra der Mūlasarvāstivādin*, 2003.
<https://www.freidok.uni-freiburg.de/data/9535>; last accessed 22/1/2016.

PrMoSū(Sa) Georg von Simson, ed. & trans. *Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins*. Teil I, II. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986, 2000 (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften, Göttingen 3/155, 238).

Ps J.H. Woods, D. Kosambi, and I.B. Horner, eds. *Papañcasūdanī Majjhimanikāya-Āṭṭhakathā of Buddhaghosācariya*, 5 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1922–1938.

PS U Ba Kyaw, trans.; Peter Masefield, ed. [Peta Stories] *Elucidation of the Intrinsic Meaning So Named the Commentary on the Peta-Stories (Paramatthadīpanī nāma Petavatthu-āṭṭhakathā) by Dhammadāpāla*. London: The Pali Text Society, 1980.

Ps-pt Dhammapāla, Līnatthapakāśinī II, Papañcasūdanī-purāṇāṭīkā (CSCD).

Pv N.A. Jayawickrama, ed. [Petavatthu] *Vimānavatthu and Petavatthu*. London: The Pali Text Society, 1977.

S Léon Feer, ed. *Samyuttanikāya*, 5 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1884–1898.

Sn Dines Andersen and Helmer Smith, eds. *Sutta-nipāta*. London: The Pali Text Society, 1984 (1st ed., 1913).

614

Overcoming Doubts

- Sp *Samantapāsādikā, Vinayatthakathā* (Sp unless otherwise noted refers to Sp E^e).
 B^e on the CSCD.
 E^e J. Takakusu, M. Nagai (and K. Mizuno for vols. 5 and 7), eds., *Samantapāsādikā, Vinayatthakathā*, 7 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1924–1947.
 N^e Nathmal Tatia, Birbal Sharma, et al., eds. [Nālandā edition] *Samantapāsādikā Aṭṭhakathā*, 3 parts. Patna: Nava Nālandā Mahāvihāra, 1964–1967.
 S^e edition on BudSir.
- Sp-t Sāriputta [from Poññoruva], *Sāratthadīpanī* (Sp-t unless otherwise noted refers to Sp-t B^e).
 B^e Sāriputta, *Sāratthadīpanī*, 3 vols. Rangoon: Chatthasaṅgīti, 1960 (also on the CSCD).
 C^e Sāriputta Mahāthera, *Sāratthadīpanī nāma Samantapāsādikāya Vinayatthakathāya tūkā*. Bihalpola Devarakkha Thera, ed. Colombo: Vidyabhusana Press, 2458/1914 (incomplete; covers the text up to B^e II 299).
- Spk F.L. Woodward, ed. *Sāratthapakāsinī, Samyuttanikāyayatthakathā*, 3 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1929–1937.
- Spk-pt Dhammapāla, *Līnatthapakāsinī III, Sāratthapakāsinī-purāṇaṭīkā*, 2 vols. Rangoon: Chatthasaṅgīti, 1961.
- Sv T.W. Rhys Davids, J. Estlin Carpenter, and W. Stede, eds. *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī, Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Dīgha Nikāya*, 3 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1968, 1971 (1st ed., 1886, 1931, 1932).
- Sv-nt [Sumaṅgalavilāsinī-navaṭīkā] Nāṇābhivamṣa, Sumaṅgalavilāsinī-abhinavaṭīkā, Sādhujanavilāsinī (CSCD).
- Sv-pt Lily de Silva, ed. *Dīghanikāyayatthakathāṭīkā Līnatthavaṇṇanā [Līnatthapakāsinī I, Sumaṅgalavilāsinī-purāṇaṭīkā]*, 3 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1970.
- Tha Hermann Oldenberg and Richard Pischel, eds.; K.R. Norman, L. Alsdorf, rev. ed. Theragāthā, in: *Therā- and Therī-Gāthā*, 2nd ed. London: The Pali Text Society, 1966.
- Thī Therīgāthā, see Tha.
- UC Peter Masefield, trans., *The Udāna Commentary (Paramatthadīpanī nāma Udānatthakathā) by Dhammapāla*, 2 vols. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 1994–1995.
- Ud Paul Steinthal, ed. *Udāna*. London: The Pali Text Society, 1982 (1st ed., 1885).

References: Primary Literature

615

- Ud-a F.L. Woodward, ed. *Paramatthādīpanī Udānatthakathā* (*Udāna Commentary*) of *Dhammapālācariya*. London: The Pali Text Society, 1926.
- Utt-vn Buddhadatta, *Uttaravinicchaya*; A.P. Buddhadatta, ed. in: *Buddhadatta's Manuals*, pt. 2: *Vinayavinicchaya and Uttaravinicchaya: Summaries of the Vinaya Piṭaka*. London: The Pali Text Society, 1927: 231ff.
- Utt-vn-ṭ Uttaravinicchayaṭīkā, in: *Vinayavinicchayaṭīkā* (*Vinayatthasārasandīpanī*), Vol. 2. Rangoon: Chatthaśaṅgīti, 1977: 401–30.
- Vibh-a A.P. Buddhadatta, ed. [Vibhaṅga-āṭṭhakathā]. *Sammoha-Vinodanī Abhidhamma-piṭake Vibhaṅgatthakathā*. London: The Pali Text Society, 1980 (1st ed., 1923).
- Vibh-mūlat Vibhaṅga-mūlaṭīkā (CSCD).
- Vin *Vinaya Piṭaka*. (Vin without further specification refers to Vin E^e).
B^e edition on CSCD.
C^e Buddha Jayantī edition (available online http://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/greti_utf.htm#; last accessed 2/5/2018).
- E^e Hermann Oldenberg, ed. *Vinaya Piṭaka*, 5 vols. London: Williams and Norgate, 1879–1883.
S^e edition on BudSir.
- VinTexts T.W. Rhys Davids, and Hermann Oldenberg, trans. *Vinaya Texts*, 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1881–1885.
- Vin-vn Buddhadatta, *Vinayavinicchaya*; A.P. Buddhadatta, ed., *Buddhadatta's Manuals*, pt. 2: *Vinayavinicchaya and Uttaravinicchaya: Summaries of the Vinaya Piṭaka*. London: The Pali Text Society, 1927: 1ff.
- Vin-vn-ṭ *Vinayavinicchayaṭīkā* (*Vinayatthasārasandīpanī*), 2 vols. Rangoon: Chatthaśaṅgīti, 1977.
- Vism Buddaghosa, *Visuddhimagga*; C.A.F. Rhys Davids, ed. 2 vols. London: The Pali Text Society, 1920–1921.
- Vjb *Vajirabuddhittherena katā Vajirabuddhiṭīkā*, Rangoon: Chatthaśaṅgīti, 1960.
- Vmv Coliya Kassapa, *Vimativinodanīṭīkā* (Vm^v unless otherwise noted refers to Vmv B^e)
B^e *Vimativinodanīṭīkā*, 2 vols., Rangoon: Chatthaśaṅgīti, 1960 (also on CSCD)
C^e Bératuduwe Dhammádhára Tissa Thero of Maháceṭiya Pirivena, ed.; Walagedara Pandita Sómálóka Tissa Théró, rev. ed. *Bhadantácariya Cóliya Kassapa Mahá Théra's Vimati-*

616

Overcoming Doubts

vinodani or the Commentary of the Vinayatthakathā. Colombo:
The Luxman Press, 2478/1935.

- VS Peter Masefield and N.A. Jayawickrama, trans. *Vimāna Stories: Elucidation of the Intrinsic Meaning So Named the Commentary on the Vimāna Stories (Paramattha-dīpanī nāma Vimānavatthu-āṭṭhakathā)*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 1997 (1st ed., 1989).
- Vv N.A. Jayawickrama, ed. *Vimāna-vatthu and Petavatthu*. London: The Pali Text Society, 1977.
- Vv-a E. Hardy, ed. *Dhammapāla's Paramattha-dīpanī*, Part IV (*Being the Commentary on the Vimānavatthu*). London: The Pali Text Society, 1901.
- WD K.R. Norman, trans. *The Word of the Doctrine (Dhammapada)*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 2000 (1st ed., 1997).
- Yam-a C.A.F. Rhys Davids, ed. [Yamaka-Āṭṭhakathā] “The Yamaka Commentary from the Pañcappakaranatthakathā”, *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, 1910–1912: 51–107.

Page 665 job: 1272818

REFERENCES : SECONDARY LITERATURE

Adikaram, E. W. 1953. *Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon*. Colombo, 2nd ed. (1st ed., 1945).

Aggacitta, Bhikkhu. 2001. *Kathina Then and Now*. Taiping, Perak: Sasanarakkha Buddhist Sanctuary. (Online-version: http://www.buddhanet.net/pdf_file/kathina.pdf; last accessed 10/1/2018).

Agostini, Giulio. 2004. "Buddhist Sources on Feticide as Distinct from Homicide", *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 27,1: 63–96.

Alsdorf, Ludwig. 1968. *Die Ārya-Strophen des Pali-Kanons metrisch hergestellt und textgeschichtlich untersucht*. Wiesbaden. (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jahrgang 1967, Nr. 4).

Anālayo, Bhikkhu. 2014. "The Mass Suicide of Monks in Discourse and Vinaya Literature" (with an addendum by Richard Gombrich), *Journal of the Oxford Centre for Buddhist Studies*, vol. 7: 11–55 [reprint: Anālayo 2017: 69–112].

———. 2017. *Vinaya Studies*. Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation (Dharma Drum Institute of Liberal Arts Research Series 7).

Bandaranayake, Senake. 1974. *Sinhalese Monastic Architecture*. Leiden: Brill (Studies in South Asian Culture, Vol. IV).

Bapat, P.V. and A. Hirakawa. 1970. *Shan-Chien-P'i-P'o-Sha. A Chinese Version by Saṅghabhadra of Samantapāśādikā: Commentary on Pali Vinaya*, translated into English for the first time. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (Bhandarkar Oriental Series, No. 10).

Bareau, André. 1953. "Abhidharmakośakārikā of Vasubandhu. Index", *VĀK* (Poona) 3: 45–83.

———. 1962. "La construction et le culte des stūpa d'après les Vinaya-pitaka", *Bulletin de l'école française d'Extrême-Orient*, t. 50/2: 229–74.

Bechert, Heinz. 1968. "Some Remarks on the Kathina Rite", *Journal of the Bihar Research Society*, 54/1–4: 319–29.

Borgland, Jens Wilhelm. 2014. *A Study of the Adhikaranavastu: Legal Settlement Procedures of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*. Thesis. Department of Culture Studies and Oriental Languages. Faculty of Humanities. University of Oslo 2014.

Bronkhorst, Johannes. 2011. *Buddhism in the Shadow of Brahmanism*. Leiden: Brill (Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section Two: South Asia, Vol. 24).

- Cabezón, José Ignacio. 2017. *Sexuality in Classical South Asian Buddhism*. Somerville MA: Wisdom Publications (Studies in Indian and Tibetan Buddhism).
- Chakrabarti, Susmita. 2016. Studies on the Kankhāvitaranī. PhD thesis, Calcutta University, 2016 [online]: <http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/handle/10603/172770?mode=full>; last accessed, 14/5/2018).
- Coomaraswamy, Ananda K. 1928. "Indian Architectural Terms", *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 48/3: 250–75.
- . 1930. "Early Indian Architecture. I. Cities and City-Gates, etc.", *Eastern Art: An Annual* 2: 209–35.
- Cousins, L.S. 1998. "Review of Oskar von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 61.1: 155–56.
- Delhey, Martin. 2006. "View on Suicide in Buddhism: Some Remarks", *Buddhism and Violence*, Michael Zimmermann et al., eds. Lumbini: Lumbini International Research Institute (LIRI Seminar Proceedings Series, Vol. 2): 25–63.
- Deokar, Mahesh A. 2008. *Technical Terms and Technique of the Pāli and the Sanskrit Grammars*. Sarnath, Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies.
- Dimitrov, Dragomir. 2016. *The Legacy of the Jewel Mind: On the Sanskrit, Pāli, and Sinhalese Works by Ratnamati: A Philological Chronicle (Phullalocanavāmsa)*. Napoli (Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale" Dipartimento Asia Africa e Mediterraneo, Series Minor LXXXII).
- Eggeling, Julius. 1885. *The Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa According to the Text of the Mādhyandina School*, pt. II: Books III and IV. Oxford: Clarendon Press (Sacred Books of the East, Vol. XXVI).
- Freiberger, Oliver. 1996. "Zur Interpretation der Brahmadanda-Strafe im buddhistischen Ordensrecht", *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 146: 456–91.
- Geiger, Magdalene and Wilhelm. 1920. *Pāli Dhamma vornehmlich in der kanonischen Literatur*. Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse, Bd. 31.1. München (reprint in: Geiger 1973, 101–228).
- Geiger, Wilhelm. 1973. *Kleine Schriften zur Indologie und Buddhismuskunde*, ed. Heinz Bechert. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag (Glasenapp-Stiftung, Bd. 6).

References: Secondary Literature

619

- . 1986. *Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times*, ed. Heinz Bechert. Stuttgart, 2nd unrevised edition (Veröffentlichungen des Seminars für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde der Universität Göttingen, No. 4).
- Gethin, R.M.L. 2001. *The Buddhist Path to Awakening*. Oxford: Oneworld.
- Gillet, Valérie. 2014. “The Dark Period: Myth or Reality?”, *The Indian Economic and Social History Review* 51.3, 1–20.
DOI: 10.1177/0019464614536018.
- Gombrich, Richard. 2014. “Addendum”, in Anālayo 2014: 43f.
- Gopi, Satheesh. 2010. *Basic Civil Engineering*. Delhi: Pearson.
- Gräfe, Udo Heiner. 1974. *Systematische Zusammenstellung kulturgeschichtlicher Informationen aus dem Vinayapitakam der Theravādin*. Göttingen. Thesis, Georg-August-Universität, Göttingen.
- Hayashi, Takatsugu. 2013. “仏典結集で収載されなかった經典：KulumbasuttaとCatuparivattasuttaを中心に（Apocryphal Suttas Not Listed in the Buddhist Councils Kulumbasutta, Catuparivattasutta and Other Source-Materials in the Atthasalini）”, *Journal of Pali and Buddhist Studies (Pārigaku bukkyō bunkagaku)* 27: 21–46. [Japanese with English Abstract at <https://ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/110009688771>].
- . 2014a. “仏典結集で収載されなかった *Rājovādasutta*（諫王経）：パーリ註釈文献の源泉資料に関する連して（Rājovādasutta: An Apocryphal Sutta Not Listed in the Buddhist Councils）”, *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies (Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū)* 62, 2: 856 (209)–849 (216)
(https://doi.org/10.4259/ibk.62.2_856) [Japanese with English Abstract in 62, 3 (2014): 1390 (326)].
- . 2014b. “仏典結集で収載されなかった *Nandopananda[-nagarajadamana]*：上座部における外典文書の形成と展開 [Nandopananda[-nāgarājadamana]: Formation and Transmission of an Apocryphal Story Not Listed in the Buddhist Councils）”, *Journal of Pali and Buddhist Studies (Pārigaku bukkyō bunkagaku)* 28: 47–68 [Japanese].
- . 2014c. “仏典結集で収載されなかった *Nandopananda[-nāgarājadamana]* と北伝資料について [The Nandopananda[-nāgarājadamana] and Parallel Stories in Indian Buddhist Literature）”, *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies (Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū)* 63, 1: 350 (203)–343 (210)
(https://doi.org/10.4259/ibk.63.1_350) [Japanese with English Abstract in 63, 3 (2015): 1374f.].
- . 2014d. “『清淨道論』に挿入された目連の竜王退治物語：ナンドーパンダ（ナンダウパナンダ）の調伏（The Taming of the Royal Naga Nandopananda: A Story Interpolated in the *Visuddhi-*

- magga)*”, *Bulletin of Hosen College of Childhood Education* 5: 37–45. [Japanese].
- . 2015. “ナーガ調伏のモチーフ: *Nandapananda[-nāgarājadamana]* の形成に関連して (The Motif of the Nāga-Taming: Formation of the Nandapananda[-nāgarājadamana])”, *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies (Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū)* 64, 1: 328–321. (https://doi.org/10.4259/ibk.64.1_328) [Japanese with English Abstract in 64,3 (2016): 1368f.].
- von Hinüber, Oskar. 1967. “Pāli ulloka-**”, *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* (Kuhn’sche Zeitschrift) 81: 247–53 (English translation in: von Hinüber 1994: 1–8).
- . 1968. *Studien zur Kasussyntax des Pāli, besonders des Vinaya-Pitaka*. München: J. Kitzinger.
- . 1979 [1980]. “Über drei Begriffe der buddhistischen Rechtssprache: *issaravatā, gīvā* und *bhaṇḍadeyya*”, *Indologica Taurinensis* 7 (Dr. Ludwik Sternbach Felicitation Volume I): 275–79 (English translation in: von Hinüber 1994: 116–22).
- . 1980. “Bemerkungen zum Critical Pāli Dictionary II”, *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 94: 10–31 (English translation in: von Hinüber 1994: 121–61).
- . 1985. “Die Bestimmung der Schulzugehörigkeit buddhistischer Texte nach sprachlichen Kriterien”, *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*, Teil 1 (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, III, 1), ed. Heinz Bechert, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse. Dritte Folge. Nr. 149), 57–75 (reprint in von Hinüber 2009: 38–56).
- . 1986. “Pāli *samaya* und Sanskrit *saṃjā*”, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 29, no. 3: 201–202. (English translation in: von Hinüber 1994: 195–97).
- . 1987. “Das buddhistische Recht und die Phonetik des Pāli. Ein Abschnitt aus der Samantapāśādikā über die Vermeidung von Aussprachefehlern in *kammavācās*”, *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 13/14 (Festschrift für Wilhelm Rau): 101–27 (English translation in: von Hinüber 1994: 198–232).
- . 1992a. “The Arising of an Offence: *āpattisamuṭṭhāna*. A Note on the Structure and History of the Theravāda-Vinaya”, *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 16: 55–69 (reprint in: von Hinüber 2009: 144–58).
- . 1992b. *Sprachentwicklung und Kulturgeschichte: Ein Beitrag zur materiellen Kultur des buddhistischen Klosterlebens*, Mainz: Franz Steiner Verlag (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur,

References: Secondary Literature

621

- Mainz. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jahrgang 1992, Nr. 6).
- . 1994. *Selected Papers on Pāli Studies*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.
- . 1995a. “Buddhist Law According to the Theravāda-Vinaya: A Survey of Theory and Practice”, *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 18/1: 7–45 (reprint in: von Hinüber 2009: 188–226).
- . 1995b, “The Nigamanas of the Sumaṅgalavilāsinī and the Kaṅkhā-vitaraṇī”, *Journal of the Pali Text Society* XXI: 129–33 (reprint in: von Hinüber 2009: 62–66).
- . 1996a. *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter (Indian Philology and South Asian Studies, Vol. 2)
- . 1996b. “Zu einer Dissertation über das buddhistische Recht”, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 40: 101–13 (reprint in: von Hinüber 2009: 233–45).
- . 1998a. *Entstehung und Aufbau der Jātaka-Sammlung. (Studien zur Literatur des Theravāda-Buddhismus I)*. Mainz: Franz Steiner Verlag (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jahrgang 1998, Nr. 7).
- . 1998b. “Miszelle. Eine Bemerkung zur Deutung des Wortes *brahma-dan̄ga* im Theravādavinaya”, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 148: 379–82 (reprint in: von Hinüber 2009: 289–92).
- . 1999. *Das Pātimokkhasutta der Theravādin. Studien zur Literatur des Theravāda-Buddhismus II*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse. Jg. 1999, Nr. 6).
- . 2000a. “Die Nonnen im Theravāda-Buddhismus: Zu einer weiteren Göttinger Dissertation über das buddhistische Recht”, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 44: 61–86 (reprint in: von Hinüber 2009: 246–70).
- . 2000b. “Lān² Nā as a Centre of Pāli Literature During the Late 15th Century”, *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 26: 119–37 (reprint in: von Hinüber 2009: I 402–20).
- . 2002. [Review of:] Heinz Bechert et alii (ed.), *Der Buddhismus I*, 2000. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 45: 77–86 (reprint in: von Hinüber 2009: 1048–57).

- . 2004. [Review of:] Jin-il Chung, Das Upasampadāvastu [and] Die Pravāraṇā, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 124.4: 806–10 (reprint in: von Hinüber 2009: 961–65).
- . 2006. “Everyday Life in an Ancient Indian Buddhist Monastery”, *ARIRIAB* 9: 3–31 (reprint in: von Hinüber 2009: 869–97).
- . 2009. *Kleine Schriften*, 2 vols., ed. Harry Falk, Walter Slaje. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag (Veröffentlichungen der Helmuth von Glasenapp-Stiftung, Bd. 47).
- . 2015. [Review of:] Heinz Bechert, Der Buddhismus in Süd- und Südostasien. Geschichte und Gegenwart, Stuttgart 2013. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 58: 255–60.
- . 2016. [Review of:] Klaus Wille, *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*, Teil 11, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 59: 306–308.
- . 2017. [Review of:] Schlingloff, Dieter. Fortified Cities of Ancient India, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 60: 187–99.
- Hoernle, A.F.R. 1908. *The Bower Manuscript*. Facsimile leaves, Nagari transcript, romanised transliteration and English translation with notes. Vol. 3: General Sanskrit Index. Calcutta: 241–343.
- Hüsken, Ute. 1997a. *Die Vorschriften für die buddhistische Nonnengemeinde im Vinaya-Pitaka der Theravādin*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag (Monographien zur Indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie, 11).
- . 1997b. “The Application of the Vinaya Term *nāsanā*”, *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 20/2: 93–111.
- Hu-von Hinüber, Haiyan. 1994. *Das Poṣadhabhavastu. Vorschriften für die buddhistische Beichfeier im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins*. Reinbek: Dr. Inge Wezler. Verlag für Orientalische Fachpublikationen (Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik, Monographie 13).
- . 1996. “Aśoka und die buddhistische Uposatha-Zeremonie (1). Aśokas 256 Nächte”, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 40: 87–99.
- . 2016. *Sambhoga: Die Zugehörigkeit zur Ordensgemeinschaft im frühen Jainismus und Buddhismus*. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies (Studia Philologica Buddhica. Monograph Series XXXIII).
- . 2017. “On the Meaning of *sambhoga* in Early Jainism and Buddhism”, *Jaina Studies: Select Papers Presented in the ‘Jaina Studies’ Section at the 16th World Sanskrit Conference Bangkok, Thailand & the 14th World Sanskrit Conference Kyoto, Japan*, ed. by Nalini Balbir and Peter Flügel. New Delhi: D. K. Publishers & Distributors, 2018 (16th World Sanskrit Conference Volume 8): 15–30.

References: Secondary Literature

623

- Inoue, Ayase. 2007–8. “*bhojaniya* & *khādaniya* (Bhojaniya and Khādaniya)”, *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies (Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū)* 56,1: 343–40 https://doi.org/10.4259/ibk.56.1_343 [Japanese, with English abstract in 56,3 (2008): 1246].
- Jaini, P.S. 2000. *Collected Papers on Jaina Studies*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsi-dass: 297–322 (1st ed.: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 57,3 (1995): 479–94).
- Jansen, Berthe. 2015. “Monastic Organizational Guidelines”, *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, Vol. I: *Literature and Languages*, ed. by Jonathan A. Silk, O. v. Hinüber, and V. Eltschinger. Leiden: Brill: 442–49.
- Juo-hsüeh, Bhikkhunī. 2000. *Controversies over Buddhist Nuns*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.
- Kabilsingh, Chatsumarn, trans. 1991. *The Bhikkhunī Pātimokha of the Six Schools*. Bangkok: Thammasat University Press.
- Keller, A. 2006. *Expounding the Mathematical Seed*. Vol. 2: *The Supplements: A Translation of Bhāskara I on the Mathematical Chapter of the Āryabhatīya*. Basel: Birkhäuser, 197–226.
- Kieffer-Pülz, Petra. 1992. *Die Sīmā. Vorschriften zur Regelung der buddhistischen Gemeindegrenze in älteren buddhistischen Texten*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag (Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie, 8).
- . 1993. “Zitate aus der Andhaka-Āṭhakathā in der Samantapāśādikā”, *Studien zur Indologie und Buddhismuskunde, Festgabe des Seminars für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde für Professor Dr. Heinz Bechert*, ed. Reinhold Grünendahl, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Petra Kieffer-Pülz. Bonn, 1993 (*Indica et Tibetica*, 22), 171–212.
- . 1997. “Rules for the *sīmā* regulation in the Vinaya and its commentaries and their application in Thailand”, *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 20/2: 141–53.
- . 2000. “Die buddhistische Gemeinde”, *Der Buddhismus I. Der indische Buddhismus und seine Verzweigungen*, ed. Heinz Bechert et al. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 2000 (Die Religionen der Menschheit, Band 24,1): 281–402.
- . 2001. “*Pārājika* 1 and *Saṅghādisesa* 1: Hitherto Untranslated Passages from the Vinayapiṭaka of the Theravādins”, *Traditional South Asian Medicine* 6: 62–84. (Slightly revised reprint in: Kieffer-Pülz 2014: 349–73).
- . 2005. [Review of] “K.R. Norman/William Pruitt (Hrsg.): *Kaṇkhā-vitaraṇī*”, Oxford: Pali Text Society 2003”, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 155: 665–70.

- . 2007. "Stretching the Vinaya Rules and Getting Away with it (11th I.B. Horner Lecture, 2005)", *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 29: 1–49.
- . 2010. "Zitate aus der Andhakaṭṭhakathā in den Subkommentaren", *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 27: 147–235.
- . 2011. "The Law of Theft: Regulations in the Theravāda Vinaya and the Law Commentaries", *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 31: 1–54.
- . 2013. *Verlorene Ganṭhipadas zum buddhistischen Ordensrecht. Untersuchungen zu den in der Vajirabuddhiṭikā zitierten Kommentaren Dhammasiris und Vajirabuddhis*, 3 vols. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag (Veröffentlichungen der indologischen Kommission, 1).
- . 2014. "Pārājika I and Sanghādisesa I: Hitherto Untranslated Passages from the Vinayapitaka of the Theravādins", *The Book of the Discipline (Vinayapiṭaka)*, Vol. I (*Suttavibhaṅga*), trans. by I.B. Horner. Bristol: The Pali Text Society: 349–73.
- . 2015a. "Quotatives indicating quotations in Pāli commentarial literature, I. *Iti/ti* and quotatives with *vuttam*", *The Reuse in Indian Philosophical texts*, ed. Elisa Freschi. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 43/4: 427–52.
- . 2015b. "Vinaya Commentarial Literature in Pāli", *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, Vol. 1: *Languages and Literatures*, ed. Jonathan A. Silk, O. v. Hinüber, V. Eltschinger. Leiden: Brill, 430–41.
- . 2015c. [Review article] "The Rules of Proper Conduct of the Mahā-sāṃghika-Lokottaravāda Tradition: Seishi Karashima's Edition of the Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ", *Indo-Iranian Journal* 58: 376–93.
- . 2015–16. "Re-ordination of Former Buddhist Nuns in the Theravāda Tradition", *Buddhism, Law and Society* 1: 1–32.
- . 2016a. "Reuse of Text in Pāli Legal Commentaries", *Buddhist Studies Review* 33/12: 9–45.
- . 2016b. "The Arrangement of the Rules in the Theravāda *Bhikkhunī-pātimokkha*", *ARIRIAB* XIX: 57–80.
- . 2017. "Saṅgharakkhita Mahāsāmi's Œuvre based on Intertextual Links in his Texts", *ARIRIAB* XX: 23–55.
- . 2018. "Sex-change in Buddhist Legal Literature with a Focus on the Theravāda tradition", *ARIRIAB* XXI: 27–62.
- . forthcoming. "The Relation of the *Saccasāṅkhepaṭikā* Called *Sārattha-sālinī* to the *Vinayavinicchayaṭikā* Called *Vinayasārathasandīpanī*", *Studies in Early Buddhism: In Memory of L.S. Cousins*, ed. Peter Harvey and Naomi Appleton.
- Klaus, Konrad. 2003. "[Review of:] Ute Hüskens, Die Regeln für die buddhistische Nonnengemeinde im Vinaya-Piṭaka der Theravādin. Berlin

References: Secondary Literature

625

- 1997”, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 153/1: 258–62.
- Lamotte, Étienne. 1988. *History of Indian Buddhism: From the Origins to the Śaka Era*, trans. by Sara Webb-Boin. Louvain-la-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain. Institute Orientaliste (French edition: 1958).
- Law, Bimala Churn. 1932. *Geography of Early Buddhism*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner.
- von Le Coq, A. 1974. *Die Buddhistische Spätantike in Mittelasien*, Teil 4: *Atlas zu den Wandmalereien* (Ergebnisse der Königlich-Preussischen Turfan-Expeditionen). Unaltered reprint Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt (1st ed., Berlin: Dietrich Reimer und Ernst Vohsen, 1924).
- Lüders, Heinrich. 1966. *Bhārhut und die buddhistische Literatur*. Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, Bd. 26,3) (1st ed., 1941).
- Matsumura, Hisashi. 1989. “A Lexical Note on the Vinaya Literature: Stūpa in the Śaikṣa Rules”, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 33: 45–92.
- Mette, Adelheid. 1991. “Notes on *samaya* ‘convention’ in Pali and Prakrit”, *Panels of the VIIth World Sanskrit Conference*, Vol. VI: *Middle Indo-Aryan and Jaina Studies*, ed. Colette Caillat, Leiden: Brill, 69–80.
- Mori, Sodo. 1989. *Studies of the Pāli Commentaries. A Provisional Collection of Articles*. Japan: Tokyo Press.
- Ñāṇadassana, Bhikkhu. 2008, see Pat 2008.
- Ñāṇamoli, Bhikkhu. 1966, see Pāt 1966.
- Ñāṇatúsita, Bhikkhu. 2014. *Analysis of the Bhikkhu-Pātimokkha*, Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society.
- Nolot, Édith. 1987. “Samghāvaśeṣa-, samghātišeṣa-, samghādisesa-”, *Bulletin d’Études Indiennes* 5: 251–72.
- . 1996. “Studies in Vinaya Technical Terms I–III”, *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 22: 73–150.
- . 1999. “Studies in Vinaya Technical Terms IV–X”, *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 25: 1–111.
- Norman, K.R. 2001. “*Vuṭṭhapeti*, *vuṭṭhāna*, and related matters”, *Indologica Taurinensia* 27: 121–37 (reprint in: Norman 2007: 199–215).
- . 2007. *Collected Papers VIII*. Lancaster: The Pali Text Society.
- Norman & Pruitt. 2008, see Pāt.
- Nyanatiloka. 1976. *Buddhistisches Wörterbuch*. Konstanz: Verlag Christiani, 2. rev. ed. (Buddhistische Handbibliothek, 3).

- Oberlies, Thomas. 2004. [Review of] “Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī by Bhadantācariya Buddhaghosa, ed. K. R. Norman and William Pruitt”, *Buddhist Studies Review* 21, 1: 85–87.
- Olivelle, Patrick. 2005. *Manu's Code of Law. A Critical Edition and Translation of the Mānava-Dharmaśāstra*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Olivelle, Patrick. 2013. *King, Governance, and Law in Ancient India. Kautilya's Arthaśāstra*. A New Annotated Translation. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Parpola, Asko. 2018. “On Ancient Indian Ox-carts, Biers, Beds and Thrones: À propos of Sanskrit śakaṭī-/śakaṭa- and its etymology”, *Indology's Pulse: Arts in Context (Doris M. Srinivasan Festschrift)*, ed. by Corinna Wessels-Mevissen and Gerd J. R. Mevissen. New Delhi: Aryan Books International, 1–42.
- Perera, L.P.N. 1993. *Sexuality in Ancient India. A Study Based on the Pali Vinayapitaka*. Colombo: The Postgraduate Institute of Pali and Buddhist Studies (Postgraduate Institute of Pali & Buddhist Studies Publications).
- Pind, Ole Holten. 1989. “Studies in the Pāli Grammarians I”, *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 13: 33–82.
- . 1990. “Studies in the Pāli Grammarians II.1”, *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 14: 175–218.
- . 2008. “The Sanskrit Version of the Pabbajjāsutta and the Question as to Why the Names of the Janapadas Are Invariably Quoted in the Plural in the Pāli Canon”, *The Mahachulalongkorn Journal of Buddhist Studies* 1: 45–51.
- Pruitt, William. 2003. [Review of:] Oskar von Hinüber, Das Pātimokkhasutta der Theravādin, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 47: 64–66.
- Ratnapala, Nandasena. 1971. Ed. and transl., *The Katikāvatas: Laws of the Buddhist Order of Ceylon From the 12th to the 18th Century*. München: R. Kitzinger (Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft, Beiheft N).
- Renou, Louis. 1939. *La Maison Védique* (Michael W. Meister, trans., “The Vedic House”, n.d., available: <http://www.arthistory.upenn.edu/meister/vedic.html#article>; last accessed 2/5/2018).
- Rhys Davids, T.W. 1877. *On the Ancient Coins and Measures of Ceylon: With a Discussion of the Ceylon Date of the Buddha's Death*, London: Trübner (The International Numismata Orientalia 1,6).
- Schlingloff, Dieter. 1963. “Zur Interpretation des Prātimokṣasūtra”, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 113: 536–51.
- . 2013. *Fortified cities of Ancient India: A Comparative Study*. London: Anthem Press.

References: Secondary Literature

627

- Schmithausen, Lambert. 2000. "Essen ohne zu töten. Zur Frage von Fleischverzehr und Vegetarismus im Buddhismus", Perry Schmidt-Leukel, ed., *Die Religionen und das Essen*. Kreuzlingen u. München: Diederichs 2000 (Diederichs Gelbe Reihe Bd. 163): 145–202.
- . 2005. "Meat-eating and Nature: Buddhist Perspectives", *Buddhism and Nature (Bukkyō to Shizen): Supplement to the Bulletin of the Research Institute of Bukkyō University*, Kyoto 2005: 183–201.
- Schopen, Gregory. 1989. "Stūpa Cult and the Extant Pāli Vinaya", *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 13: 83–100 (reprint in: Schopen 1997: 86–98).
- . 1997. *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks: Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- . 2004. *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters: Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press (Studies in the Buddhist Traditions).
- Seyfort Ruegg, David. 1969. *La théorie du Tathāgatagarbha et du Gotra: Études sur la sotériologie et la gnoséologie du bouddhisme*. Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2007. "Good and Evil in Indian Buddhism: The Five Sins of Immediate Retribution", *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 35: 253–86.
- Skilling, Peter. 1998. "A Note on Dhammapada 60 and the Length of the Yojana", *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 24: 149–70.
- . 2006. "Jātaka and Paññāsa-jātaka in South-East Asia", *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 28: 113–73 (reprint in: Skilling 2009: 161–217).
- . 2009. *Buddhism and Buddhist Literature of South-East Asia: Selected Papers*, ed. Claudio Cicuzza. Bangkok and Lumbini: Fragile Palm Leaves Foundation [and] Lumbini International Research Institute (Materials for the Study of the Tripitaka, Volume 5).
- Stuart, Daniel M. 2017. "Legislating Consent: Dispute, Accord and the Vote in Early Indian Monasticisms", Susan Andrews, Jinhua Chen, Cuilan Liu (eds.), *Rules of Engagement: Medieval Traditions of Buddhist Monastic Regulation*. Bochum/Freiburg: Projektverlag (Hamburg Buddhist Studies, 9): 225–67.
- Taw Sein Ko. 1893. "A Preliminary Study of the Kalyāṇī Inscriptions of Dhammadhetti 1476 A.D.", *Indian Antiquary* 22: 11–17, 29–53, 85–89, 150–59, 206–13, 236–43.
- Ṭhānissaro, Bhikkhu. 2007. *The Buddhist Monastic Code*, 2 vols., 2nd ed., revised, 2007.
- Vajirañāṇavarorasa. 1969, 1973, 1983. *The Entrance to the Vinaya: Vinaya-mukha*, Vols. I–III. Bangkok: Mahāmakut Rājavidyālaya Press.

- Vogel, Claus. 1997. "On the Date of the Posadha Ceremony as Taught by the Mūlasarvāstivādins", *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. by Petra Kieffer-Pülz, and Jens-Uwe Hartmann. Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica (Indica et Tibetica, Bd. 30), 673–88.
- Wijayaratne, Mohan. 2010. *Buddhist Nuns: The Birth and Development of a Women's Monastic Order*. Revised edition, Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society (1st ed., 2001).
- Wynne, Alexander. 2004. "The Oral Transmission of the Early Buddhist Literature", *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 27,1: 97–127.
- Yamagiwa, Nobuyuki. 2002. "Ārāmika. Gardener or Park Keeper?", *Buddhist and Indian Studies in Honour of Professor Sodō Mori*, ed. by the Publication Committee. Hamamatsu: Kokusai Bukkyoto Kyokai (International Buddhist Association): 363–85.
- Zin, Monika. 2006. *Mitleid und Wunderkraft. Schwierige Bekehrungen und ihre Ikonographie im indischen Buddhismus*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

1272818 0 Trimmed page size: 216x138mm (Defined by small dashed line)

Magenta guides show margin positions as: Head = 17mm

Back = 17mm



1272818 0 Trimmed page size: 216x138mm (Defined by small dashed line)

Magenta guides show margin positions as: Head = 17mm

Back = 17mm



