

Vinaya Class Questions

Series 'B'

<https://vinaya-class.github.io>

LAST UPDATED ON
22nd July 2023

CONTENTS

0.B. Introduction	1
1.B. Killing and Harming	5
2.B. Stealing	9
3.B. Sexual Conduct	13
4.B. Lustful Conduct	15
5.B. Women 1	17
6.B. Attainments	19

1.

Mark which of the following **are factors** in determining an offense.

- (a) Whether the other bhikkhu or lay person was offended or not.
 - ☒ (b) The result of the action by body or speech.
 - (c) The number of witnesses.
 - ☒ (d) The object which the offense was committed with/to.
 - (e) The effort of finding supporting cases.
 - (f) The intention of kindness and compassion.
-

2.

‘A person who is criticized should ground themselves in two things.’ What are these two?

- (a) Recollecting the faults of others.
- (b) A well-reasoned defense.
- ☒ (c) Speaking the truth.
- (d) A witness to prove his innocence.
- ☒ (e) Even temper.

Solution: ‘... sacce ca, akuppe ca.’ **AN 5.167, Accusation**

3.

Mark the items which are **wrong reasons** for deciding what is allowable.

- ☒ (a) It creates greater harmony if the bhikkhus are not anxious about eating a few minutes after noon.
- ☒ (b) Since bhikkhus should be easy to look after, they shouldn’t cause worry for lay people about whether the food is offered or not.
- ☒ (c) Ajahn X also goes to a bar with friends, so let’s not worry about a quick drink.
- ☒ (d) Since we started pulling out the weeds anyway, let’s dig up the roots to do it properly.
- ☒ (e) What about Ajahn X? He never has any restraint, doing this is still not as bad as him.

Solution: They are logical fallacies:

- (a) is reasoning from effect.
- (b) is using an existing principle in the wrong context.
- (c) an appeal to hypocrisy doesn’t justify one’s wrongdoing.
- (d) two wrongs don’t make one right.
- (e) Personal attack (*ad hominem*) and whataboutism.

4.

A young man (over 20) receives upasampadā. After the Vassa, he leaves to visit his family, but he never returns to the monastery. His upajjhāya disapproves of it, but he takes up residence in a lay retreat centre.

(a) Is he still under nissaya to his upajjhāya?

☒ Yes

(B) No

(b) While not being a resident at the monastery, what are some examples of his duties to his upajjhāya?

(c) Under what condition is he no longer a member of the group, i.e. left the *samvāsa*?

5.

A bhikkhu is offered a pack of Chinese sweets in the afternoon. He can't read any of the text but it looks fruity with sugar.

(a) How can he determine if it is allowable to consume or not?

(A) His friend wouldn't have offered anything unsuitable.

(B) If he has no intention to commit an offense, it is allowable to eat one.

(C) If it has not been prohibited before, it is allowable according to the Four Great Standards.

☒ (D) If it is similar to fruit jelly, it is allowable according to the Four Great Standards.

(b) He decides to eat one, and finds out that it is dried fruit. Is this an offense?

(A) saṅghādisesa

(B) thullaccaya

☒ (C) pācittiya

(D) dukkaṭa

(E) no offense

6.

True or False.

(a) F The Vinaya allows minor offenses in cases when community work requires it.

(b) T A bhikkhu may receive upasampadā during the Vassa in one monastery, and spend the Vassa elsewhere.

Discussion: What is essential for a valid bhikkhu upasampadā?

(c) F After a bhikkhu receives upasampadā, he can only take nissaya on his upajjhāya.

(d) F When a bhikkhu puts on lay clothes, he effectively disrobes and is no longer a bhikkhu.

Discussion: What are the factors of the disrobing procedure?

(e) T One of the Four Great Standards is as follows: 'If it is not already allowed, but it goes against what it prohibited, that is allowable.'

- (f) F When a bhikkhu is short on time to finish a task for the community, breaking a *korwat* rule is not an offense.

Discussion: What are some examples of local standards, or *korwat* rules? Cf. MN 48, Uda 4.5, Mv X on disputes at Kosambī. The Buddha then visits the park where Ven. Anuruddha, Nandiya and Kimbila were living in harmony, blending as ‘milk and water’ (MN 31).

1.B. KILLING AND HARMING

Kim nāmo si:

1.

A bhikkhu is afflicted with sleepwalking, community members have seen him walk about at night, while he doesn't remember it in the morning. This bhikkhu is disgruntled with another bhikkhu, they have frequent clashes and arguments. One morning, the other bhikkhu is found dead in his kuti in a pool of blood, with a stab wound on his chest. A knife which matches the size of the wound is found in the kuti of the bhikkhu known for sleepwalking, his robes have tears from a struggle and blood stains. Community members have seen him walk about at the previous night, but he doesn't remember anything.

Is the bhikkhu pārājika?

(a) Yes

(b) No

Solution: Can he be considered insane while sleepwalking? Psychosis is described as an acute or chronic mental state marked by loss of contact with reality, disorganized speech and behaviour, and often by hallucinations or delusions.

Did he act with the intention to kill? A normally self-controlled person, under the effects of drugs or alcohol, can also act aggressively and violently. In most jurisdictions, intoxication is not a defense to a charge of murder, as the law generally holds individuals responsible for their actions even if they were under the influence of drugs or alcohol at the time.

The situation has known legal precedent:

Homicidal Somnambulism: A Case Report ([researchgate.net](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312111111))

"A case of a homicide and an attempted homicide during presumed sleepwalking is reported in which somnambulism was the legal defense and led to an acquittal."

The Commentary's definition of being insane exempts bhikkhus under psychosis-inducing drugs, but not common intoxicants.

"The Commentary defines as insane anyone who 'goes about in an unseemly way, with deranged perceptions, having cast away all sense of shame and compunction, not knowing whether he has transgressed major or minor training rules.' A bhikkhu under the influence of a severe psychosis-inducing drug would apparently fall under this exemption, but one under the influence of a more common intoxicant would not."

2.

An elderly relative of a bhikkhu falls into a comatose state and is taken to the hospital. On previous occasions he used to speak against his life being extended by life-support equipment. In the hospital, the doctor informs the bhikkhu that there is not much chance of recovery, and asks the bhikkhu whether they should turn off the life-support. He replies, "Turn it off. That seems to be what he wanted in such a situation". The doctor turns off the equipment and the person dies shortly thereafter.

Is the bhikkhu pārājika?

(a) Yes

☒ (b) No

Solution: Discontinuing treatment does not cut off the life faculty, hence the factor of effort is not fulfilled.

3.

A bhikkhu is talking to himself in his kuti, “How could that evil man X steal from the Sangha. He would be better as dead.”

Can such indirect statements qualify as commands or recommendations under *Pr 3*?

(a) Yes

☒ (b) No

Solution: “O, if only so-and-so were murdered.” According to the Vibhaṅga, this statement incurs a *dukkāṭa* regardless of whether it is made in public or private, but does not fulfil effort under *Pr 3*.

4.

A bhikkhu is sweeping off insects from the porch while lay visitors are standing nearby. He drops a hint, “It might be a good idea to get rid of these ant colonies.”

Can such indirect statements qualify as commands or recommendations under *Pc 61*?

☒ (a) Yes

(b) No

Solution: There is no room for *kappiya-vohāra* in *Pc 61*. Whatever one says in hopes of inciting someone else to kill an animal would fulfil the factor of effort.

Pc 61 thus differs from *Pr 3*, under which commanding covers only clear imperatives.

5.

A bhikkhu is cleaning up on the monastery grounds after a festival. A paper plate with leftover food is swarming with ants, he picks it up and throws it all in a rubbish bag, knowing that with no way out, the ants will undoubtedly die in the bag.

Did the bhikkhu commit an offense?

(a) Yes, because he acts intentionally.

☒ (b) No, because he is not directly aiming at killing them.

(c) Yes, because intentionally or unintentionally taking the life of any living being is immoral.

(d) No, because his intention is to clean up.

6.

A bhikkhu is attacked by an aggressive dog.

(a) He hits it on the head with a stick to ward it off, and the dog retreats with bleeding wounds. Later, the owner complains to the community that the dog died. Did the bhikkhu commit an offense?

(A) thullaccaya

(B) pācittiya

(C) dukkaṭa

☒ (D) no offenses

Solution: If an action that results in an animal’s death is motivated by a purpose other than causing death, it is not an offense.

- (b) When the bhikkhu is walking again in the same area, another enraged dog attacks him, bites his leg and holds on. The bhikkhu grabs a stone and keeps hitting the animal until it drops dead. Are there offenses?

(A) thullaccaya (B) ☒ pācittiya (C) dukkaṭa (D) no offenses

Solution: He might not be aiming to kill it with the first blow, but if the dog doesn't let go, he is probably scared enough to hit it until it dies.

7.

Rats begin to be attracted to the trash around the bins at the monastery.

- (a) A lay manager buys some traps and kills several of them. He asks the work monk if he should continue, who raises an eyebrow and shrugs, but says nothing. The manager is encouraged by the lack of criticism and continues exterminating the rats. Are there offenses?

(A) thullaccaya (B) pācittiya (C) dukkaṭa (D) no offenses

Solution: If the non-committed shrug is a form of *kappiya-vohāra* (hoping to encourage the manager to kill the rats), this is not permitted under Pc 61 and the offense is pācittiya.

No offenses if the bhikkhu was expressing his doubt. The community may provide clear instructions for the lay manager on what is and is not a proper course of action for him.

- (b) The bhikkhus tell the lay manager to stop putting out traps, and instead, get a cat from a farm. The cat is very effective: it leaves dead rats, birds, lizards, etc. on the porch. Are there offenses?

(A) thullaccaya (B) ☒ pācittiya (C) dukkaṭa (D) no offenses

Solution: Whatever one says in the hope that an animal will die is *kappiya-vohāra*. The instruction to get the cat is not an instruction to kill, but has the anticipated result that it will kill the rats.

2.B. STEALING

Kim nāmo si:

1.

A bhikkhu sees a shiny new phone sitting on a bench in a park. He assumes that it has been left behind by its owner and perceives it as ownerless. Without making any effort to find the owner, he puts the phone in his yarm with the intention of keeping it for himself. The owner returns to the bench a few minutes later, looking for their phone. The bhikkhu pretends he hasn't seen anything. The owner becomes distressed as he keeps searching the area around the bench. After a few minutes, the bhikkhu tosses the phone on the bench and scolds him, "Here, that should teach you a lesson, be more mindful next time."

Did the bhikkhu commit an offense?

- (a) Pācittiya, because he deceived the owner.
- (b) Thullaccaya, because he returned the item.
- ☒ (c) Pārājika, because he knows it was not abandoned, and intends to keep it.
- (d) No offenses, because the owner has already left when the bhikkhu found the phone.

Solution: Object: Taking any object that belongs to someone else and is guarded, protected, claimed, or possessed by them is considered stealing. A phone is usually valuable enough to qualify for pārājika. The bhikkhu knows the phone must belong to somebody, and the owner retains a sense of ownership of it.

Perception: He perceives it as not given, and not abandoned.

Intention: He intends to keep it, not to borrow it or take it on trust.

Effort: He puts it in his yarm.

At this point the factors for pārājika are fulfilled.

2.

How does perception play a role in stealing? Mark all correct answers.

- (a) Stealing is always an offense regardless of one's perceptions, which may be unreliable.
 - ☒ (b) If a bhikkhu believes that the object is ownerless or thrown away, taking it is not an offense.
 - (c) If a bhikkhu takes māla-beads which were hanging from a Stupa, there is no offense.
 - ☒ (d) If a bhikkhu takes an object thinking that the owner will not mind, but he is later displeased, there is no offense if he returns the item.
-

3.

A bhikkhu on *tudong* stops under the shade of some eucalyptus trees. He boils some water for a drink with a camping stove. The stove falls over, ignites the dry leaves and twigs on the ground, and the eucalyptus plantation starts to burn. The owner expects compensation from the Saṅgha for the damage caused by the bhikkhu.


Did the bhikkhu commit an offense? Mark all correct answers.

- (a) Yes, the bhikkhu committed a *pārājika* offense, because burning is a form of taking what is not given.
- ☒ (b) Yes, the bhikkhu committed a *dukkata* offense, because he caused damage to someone else's property.
- (c) No, because the bhikkhu did not intend to cause the fire.
- (d) No, if the compensation is paid.

4.

A bhikkhu is on alms-round, standing at the market place. A lay person walks up to him, glances at the bhikkhu and puts a bag of fruit on the ground next to him, then walks off without a word. The bhikkhu knows the fruit is not formally offered, but places them in his yarm and eats them later.

Are there offenses?

- (a) pārājika (b) thullaccaya (c) pācittiya (d) dukkaṭa (e)  no offenses

Solution: The fruit is clearly intended and given to the bhikkhu, although not in the usual manner.

5.

Mark the following items as either **L** (*lahubhaṇḍa*) or **G** (*garubhaṇḍa*).

- (a) **L** A lacquered ornamental water bowl for blessings.
 (b) **G** A garden-shed on the monastery land.
 (c) **G** A motorized wheel-barrow.
 (d) **G** A plastic chair.
 (e) **L** An office computer.
 (f) **G** An electric golf-cart.
 (g) **L** An arctic-rated sleeping bag.
 (h) **G** A tree on the monastery land.
 (i) **G** A stack of wooden beams for construction.
 (j) **L** A silk robe for the abbot.

6.

One of the bhikkhus has left for a time, visiting another monastery. He locked his kuṭi and left the key in a safe place, but accessible to the community. Another bhikkhu wants to use the iPad tablet of the bhikkhu who is away. He reasons to himself “I can take it on trust, he won’t mind, we live in the same monastery after all”, although he hasn’t spoken much to him in the recent months apart from routine greetings. He gets the key to his kuṭi and takes the iPad. While walking back to his kuṭi, he trips up on a branch and drops the iPad, which breaks. When the other bhikkhu returns he finds out and is upset about someone accessing the iPad without asking him.

Has the bhikkhu who took the iPad committed an offense? Mark all correct answers.

- (a) Yes, the bhikkhu committed a *pārājika* offense, because he knew the object is valuable and took it without permission to take it on trust.
- (b) Yes, the bhikkhu committed a *dukkata* offense, because he caused damage to someone else's property.
- (c) No offenses, because the bhikkhu did not have any ill intentions or malice towards the owner, and the damage to the iPad was accidental.
- (d) No offenses, because the bhikkhu took the iPad on trust, with the intention of returning it.

Solution: One might argue that he didn't have 'the mind of a thief', since he probably wants to return it later, although he doesn't meet the criteria for 'taking it on trust' either.

3.B. SEXUAL CONDUCT

Kim nāmo si:

1.

A bhikkhu gets involved in a party at a lay friend's apartment, gets drunk and has sex with a woman, but he can't remember whether he disrobed or not before it happened.

The lay friend who hosted the party realizes that the bhikkhu is distressed and informs him that he was his witness for disrobing before he took the woman to bed. The bhikkhu, having been drunk, still can't remember a thing.

Is the disrobing valid?

(a) Yes

(b) No

Solution: Yes, if he was consciously and knowingly disrobing, even if somewhat intoxicated.

No, if he was under the effect of drugs and can be considered insane. Being drunk isn't considered being insane.

2.

A bhikkhu on alms-round is approached by his ex-girlfriend. She puts some sweets in his bowl, looks him in the eye, and while he is thus captivated, she kisses him.

Are there any offenses?

(a) pārājika

(b) saṅghādisesa

(c) thullaccaya

(d) no offenses

Solution: The exception for not consenting or not desiring contact would be difficult to invoke here.

Pārājika, if the bhikkhu's tongue enters her mouth.

Saṅghādisesa, if it's a quick kiss which he is not resisting.

3.

On a festival day, a bhikkhu eats way too much sweets. While lying down after the meal, he gets completely wrapped up in sexual fantasies and has an emission of semen.

(a) Are there any offenses?

(A) pārājika

☒ (B) saṅghādisesa

☒ (C) thullaccaya

(D) no offenses

Solution: Saṅghādisesa, if he was aware that he is causing an emission. Thullaccaya otherwise.

(b) What are the next steps he must follow according to Vinaya?

(A) He vows to never consume any sugar ever again.

☒ (B) Confess the offense to a bhikkhu sometime before the next uposatha.

☒ (C) Find a bhikkhu and confess the offense immediately.

(D) No next steps are necessary other than restraint and mindfulness in the future. Even if he is incorrect, the blanket confession before the uposatha will clear the offense.

4.

Mark the following statements as **True** or **False** under **Sg 1**.

- (a) T An effort motivated by a purpose other than causing an emission is a valid non-offense.
- (b) F Consent without physical effort is a valid non-offense.
- (c) F Three factors are required for an offense (result, intention, effort).
- (d) T Physical effort made with one's eyes (e.g. staring) count as bodily effort.
Solution: Ven. Udāyin's case of staring at the private parts of his ex-wife.
- (e) F Providing a semen sample for medical examination is not an offense.
- (f) T Intention without effort and result is not an offense.
- (g) F Fantasizing while looking at sexual objects is not an offense.
- (h) T A bhikkhu under the influence of intoxicants would not be exempt from penalties.
- (i) F The probation and penance process may be undertaken without an offense to purify one's mind.
- (j) F In reasonable cases the community may decide to skip the probation and penance process.

4.B. LUSTFUL CONDUCT

Kim nāmo si:

1.

A bhikkhu is approached by a woman on alms-round. She puts bread and fruit in his alms-bowl, then clasps his hands, smiling warmly.

Are there any offenses?

- (a) saṅghādisesa (b) thullaccaya (c) pācittiya (d) dukkaṭa (e) no offenses
-

2.

A woman offers food to a bhikkhu on alms-round, then she starts chatting with him. She wants to know everything about where the monastery is, how the monks live, and how to practice meditation. After a while the bhikkhu starts to leave, but the woman follows him. They keep talking until they arrive at the monastery. Are there any offenses?

- (a) saṅghādisesa (b) thullaccaya (c) pācittiya (d) dukkaṭa (e) no offenses

Solution: Although Pc 7 is not an offense when responding to questions, alms-round is not a suitable time to engage in teaching or conversations.

Possible pācittiya under Pc 67 (Travelling by arrangement with a woman).

In the spirit of Ay 2 and Pc 45, it is not suitable for a bhikkhu to be walking alone with a woman on the empty roads between villages.

3.

A bhikkhu downloads an app which includes advertisements. Some of the ads displayed are women in sexually provocative poses. The bhikkhu closes the app. Later, he keeps opening and closing it until he sees the same advertisement.

Are there any offenses?

- (a) saṅghādisesa (b) thullaccaya (c) pācittiya (d) dukkaṭa (e) no offenses

Solution: Sg 2, touching a doll with lustful intention is a dukkaṭa offense.

4.

A female visitor has just arrived at the monastery. She has visited before, and when she sees the guest monk, she is excited to see him again, so she hugs him and gives him a kiss on the cheek.

Are there any offenses?

- (a) saṅghādisesa (b) thullaccaya (c) pācittiya (d) dukkaṭa (e) no offenses

5.

A bhikkhu downloads a popular chatbot app to see what it can do. Jokingly, he starts erotic topics with the chatbot. He later returns to the app and keeps up the romantic messaging.

(a) Did the bhikkhu commit an offense?

- (A) saṅghādisesa (B) thullaccaya (C) pācittiya (D) dukkaṭa (E) no offenses

Solution: Comparable to deliberately making lustful contact with a doll or photos of a woman.

Notes: **Replika AI: Your Money or Your Wife (2013 March)** 'Replika' removes an adult filter from their popular chatbot, which earlier featured erotic roleplay. Users wail and lament as if they lost their wives.

(b) What if the app's marketing makes it clear that the chatbot's AI-generated messages are supplemented with messages from human agents?

- (A) saṅghādisesa (B) thullaccaya (C) pācittiya (D) dukkaṭa (E) no offenses

Solution: The object now qualifies for lewd speech under Sg 3.

6.

A bhikkhu is working on a cutting a wooden board in the workshop. A visiting lay woman comes in for a tool, and while leaving, accidentally bumps into the bhikkhu, who drops the board, which breaks and splits. He is annoyed and curses in a muffled voice, 'F*** it!' Now she is annoyed, and talks back. When she leaves the workshop, he shakes his fist and shows the finger in her direction.

Are there any offenses?

- (a) saṅghādisesa (b) thullaccaya (c) pācittiya (D) dukkaṭa (e) no offenses

Solution: Although statements which would involve Sg 3 does not have to involve a desire for sex, it also does not refer to statements made in anger, which come under Pc 2 (Insult). There seem to be no offenses assigned in the Vinaya for acting like a petulant teenager.

7.

Mark the following statements as **True** or **False**.

- (a) T Complimenting a woman on her clothing or appearance without any lustful connotations is not an offense.
- (b) T Helping a woman to get up from the ground by offering a supporting hand is not an offense.
- (c) F Sg 3 (lewd speech) only applies to women who are married.
- (d) F Telling a man that certain religions describe sexual intercourse as part of the spiritual journey is an offense under Sg 3.
- (e) F Insulting language used towards a woman is always a pācittiya offense.
- (f) T Frivolous speech and unbecoming associations with lay people are grounds for censure or banishment.


5.B. WOMEN 1

Kim nāmo si:

1.

A bhikkhu arrives at Phoenix (Arizona, USA) airport. A self-driving Waymo ride has been arranged to take him to Wat Pa Thai Buddhist temple. The car however gets into a junction it doesn't know how to handle, and pulls off to the side, waiting for a manual driver from Waymo. A woman arrives, gets into the car and drives the bhikkhu to his destination.

Are there any offenses?

- (a) saṅghādisesa (b) thullaccaya (c)  pācittiya (d) dukkaṭa (e) no offenses

Solution: A car qualifies for Pc 44 (Private secluded place).

Pc 67 (Travelling by arrangement with a woman) is relevant, although in this case it was not by arrangement.





Waymo expands its rider-only territories (2022, Dec)

"I took a Waymo in Phoenix the other night. Works like magic. I'm honestly fine waiting four times as long for one because it's fun, and it's cheaper. Even when they had to send out a manual driver, the experience was smooth and fast."

2.

A recently ordained young bhikkhu is visiting his family. At his parent's house, he takes his motorbike for a quick ride. He meets his ex-girlfriend, who hops on behind him. They ride around the village and the surrounding fields until the evening, feeling free as the wind.

Are there any offenses?

- (c)  saṅghādisesa (b)  thullaccaya (c)  pācittiya (d)  dukkaṭa (e) no offenses

3.

A woman staying at the monastery becomes friendly with a bhikkhu. She wants to offer him a crystal pyramid as a gift.

How should the bhikkhu respond? Write an appropriate response below.

e.g.: It is best to offer it to the abbot as a gift to the community

4.

A female visitor is just about to leave the monastery. She starts chatting with a bhikkhu about the experience she had during her visit, and she finds out that a male friend of hers is arriving that afternoon. She gets excited, writes a message on a piece of paper and pushes it into the front pocket of the bhikkhu's jacket.

(a) When the other visitor arrives, the bhikkhu hands the message over to him. Did he commit an offense?

- (A)  saṅghādisesa (B)  thullaccaya (C) pācittiya (D)  dukkaṭa (E) no offenses

(b) Instead of passing on the message himself, the bhikkhu gives it to the guest monk, who warns the bhikkhu and throws the message away without reading it.

Did either bhikkhus commit an offense?

(A) saṅghādisesa (B) thullaccaya (C) pācittiya (D) dukkaṭa (E) no offenses

Solution: If the message is about them meeting in some way:

Dukkaṭa for accepting the message. Thullaccaya for delivering it. Saṅghādisesa if the bhikkhu tells the woman (verbally, or by email, etc.)

5.

A bhikkhu is visiting his home town, meeting with a group of friends. They are all getting along cheerfully, and start playing a board game. They spend the evening with games, dancing, singing, playing instruments, and conversations about their lives. Their spirits are elevated and afterwards they praise the bhikkhu for being gentle, congenial, pleasant to speak with, smiling, welcoming, friendly and open.

Are there any offenses?

(a) saṅghādisesa (b) thullaccaya (c) pācittiya (D) dukkaṭa (e) no offenses

6.B. ATTAINMENTS

Kim nāmo si:

1.

Are there offenses?

- (a) A visitor asks a bhikkhu if he has attained *samādhi*. He responds that he concentrates on always keeping his mind close to *nibbāna*.

Discussion: How is a bhikkhu said to be close to *nibbāna*?

Solution: Dh 32: A monk who approves of non-negligence / and sees the danger in negligence / cannot decline / and is close to Nibbāna. (*nibbānasseva santike*).

(A) pārājika (B) thullaccaya (C) pācittiya (D) dukkaṭa (E) no offenses

- (b) A lay visitor asks a bhikkhu whether he really believes in rebirth. The bhikkhu tells them the circumstances of a past life which he remembers since childhood.

(A) pārājika (B) thullaccaya (C) pācittiya (D) dukkaṭa (E) no offenses

- (c) The guest monk, when receiving visitors to the monastery, finds out their Chinese Zodiac signs from their birth date and makes helpful suggestions about compatible practices for them. Some are offended but don't tell him anything, while others are impressed and praise him for his knowledge. He tells them about his extensive research.

(A) pārājika (B) thullaccaya (C) pācittiya (D) dukkaṭa (E) no offenses

Solution: Claims of 'animal knowledge' (*tiracchāna-vijjā*).

- (d) A bhikkhu sees a visitor reading a book with the title 'The Power of the Zodiacs'. He tells them that he used to read that kind of rubbish as well, but now he only reads the pure Dhamma, which is surely superior than such diluted worldly hodgepodge.

(A) pārājika (B) thullaccaya (C) pācittiya (D) dukkaṭa (E) no offenses

Solution: Religious bigotry, although offensive, has not been assigned an offense in the Vinaya.

- (e) A lay visitor tells a bhikkhu about their out-of-body experiences during meditation.

Write an appropriate response below.

e.g.: A safe way is to practise *satipaṭṭhāna*, 'knowing the expansive mind (*mahaggatam*)'.

- (f) A bhikkhu invites another bhikkhu, 'Come and visit my enlightened teacher in India. In our community we think it's OK to speak about attainments when they are true.'

(A) pārājika (B) thullaccaya (C) pācittiya (D) dukkaṭa (E) no offenses

Solution: Assuming that he is not hinting, he is not making any claims, only being over-zealous.

(g) A bhikkhu is intensely intent on meditating during the all-night sitting, but he falls asleep. He has an amazing dream about meditating in the Dhamma Hall, seeing lights, visions, past lives with an expansive mind. The next morning he tells a lay friend that he had great insights during the sitting and surely attained something.

(A) pārajika (B) thullaccaya (C) pācittiya (D) dukkaṭa (E) no offenses

Solution: Pc 8: *Factual* means factual from the bhikkhu's own point of view, regardless of whether he attained superior states or not.

If he attained superior states, but he thinks he didn't, and yet tells someone that he did, the offense is *pārajika*.